

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petitions of 158 pastors of churches, Sunday school officers and teachers, of Lafayette, Ind., and citizens of Jasper County, Ind., to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the American Blind People's Higher Education and General Improvement Association, favoring the higher education of the blind—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Resolutions of the American Chamber of Commerce, of Paris, France, in favor of the adoption of the metric system in the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolutions of United Israel Lodge, No. 182, Order of B'rith Abraham, of New York City, N. Y., relating to methods of the Immigration Bureau at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of the Medical Association of Central New York, favoring the establishment of a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 6498, for the purchase of land in Somerset County, Pa., for a military camp—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Blind People's Higher Education and General Improvement Association, favoring the higher education of the blind, as provided in Senate bill 4038—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Resolution of Local Union No. 70, International Union of Steam Engineers, Brazil, Ind., urging the passage of House bill 3076, for an eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the American Blind People's Higher Education and General Improvement Association, favoring Senate bill 4038—to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolution of the Medical Association of Central New York, favoring the establishment of a laboratory for the study of the criminal, pauper, and defective classes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, protest of Maccabee Lodge, No. 49, Order of Sons of Benjamin, Brooklyn, N. Y., against the exclusion of Jewish immigrants at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Malt-Diastase Company, Brooklyn, N. Y., for a reduction of the tax on alcohol to 70 cents per proof gallon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the National Army and Navy Spanish War Veterans' Association, of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2172, for the payment of medical expenses of sick officers and enlisted men of the Army while absent from duty with leave or on furlough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolutions of the Black Hills Mining Men's Association, of South Dakota, for the creation of an independent department of mines and mining—to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. MICKEY: Petition of citizens and business men of the city of Quincy, Ill., for the improvement of the Upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of the Stockton Quarterly Conference, Rooks County, Kans., in favor of legislation in restraint of the liquor traffic—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, favoring the passage of bills to increase the jurisdiction and powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILSON: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring antipolygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of retail druggists of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Stereotypers' Union No. 1, of New York City, favoring the repeal of the desert-land law—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolutions of the legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Pennsylvania, in favor of House bill 15990—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of the same organization, favoring Senate bill 3560, known as the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Blind People's Higher Education and General Improvement Association, favoring the higher education of the blind, as provided in Senate bill 4038—to the Committee on Education.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 12, 1903.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington. The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. BEVERIDGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

VETO MESSAGE—KATIE A. NOLAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

To the Senate:

I return herewith Senate bill No. 4308, entitled "An act for the relief of Katie A. Nolan."

Executive approval of this bill is withheld for the reason that it appears to be a duplication of legislation. The deficiency act of July 1, 1902, contained the following provision:

"To enable the Postmaster-General to pay Katie A. Nolan balance of salary due her as stamp clerk in the post-office at San Antonio, Tex., from July 1, 1889, to July 1, 1893, \$800."

Under this provision of said act Katie A. Nolan, the beneficiary named in this bill, was paid \$800 by the postmaster at San Antonio, Tex., by direction of the Postmaster-General, as shown by the records of the Post-Office Department.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

WHITE HOUSE, February 11, 1903.

SLOOP SALLY MARIAH.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the findings by the court relating to the vessel sloop *Sally Mariah*, John Sells, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 7185) to authorize the board of commissioners for the Connecticut bridge and highway district to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River at Hartford, in the State of Connecticut.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 16656) regulating the importation of breeding animals; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15429) to increase the efficiency of the Army.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 149) to provide for holding terms of court in the district of Utah;

A bill (H. R. 305) granting an increase of pension to George Heinzman;

A bill (H. R. 1014) granting a pension to Laura Levenseler;

A bill (H. R. 1015) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Russell;

A bill (H. R. 1423) granting an increase of pension to Asa Tarbox;

A bill (H. R. 1531) granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Duncan;

A bill (H. R. 1829) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brill;

A bill (H. R. 1923) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Damon;

A bill (H. R. 2614) granting a pension to John Sullivan;

A bill (H. R. 2675) granting an increase of pension to John M. Stanley;

A bill (H. R. 2812) granting a pension to Susan Kent;

A bill (H. R. 3578) granting an increase of pension to Erastus E. Edmunds;

A bill (H. R. 3899) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 4118) granting a pension to Charles Maschmeyer;

A bill (H. R. 4153) granting a pension to Jane Hale;

A bill (H. R. 4183) granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Kafer;

A bill (H. R. 4266) granting a pension to Henry Ehmke;

A bill (H. R. 4441) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Brewster;

A bill (H. R. 5450) granting a pension to Charles P. Bigelow;  
 A bill (H. R. 5511) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus V. Gorrell;  
 A bill (H. R. 5898) granting an increase of pension to Reuben F. Carter;  
 A bill (H. R. 5918) granting a pension to Margaret Fox;  
 A bill (H. R. 5920) granting a pension to Washington T. Filson;  
 A bill (H. R. 6161) granting an increase of pension to Homer Davis;  
 A bill (H. R. 7778) granting a pension to Peter Buckley;  
 A bill (H. R. 7851) granting an increase of pension to Jennie H. Cramer;  
 A bill (H. R. 8254) granting an increase of pension to John R. Curry;  
 A bill (H. R. 8617) granting a pension to Sabina Lalley;  
 A bill (H. R. 8626) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Yemans;  
 A bill (H. R. 9074) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Gates;  
 A bill (H. R. 9814) granting an increase of pension to Mary Williams;  
 A bill (H. R. 9987) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Young;  
 A bill (H. R. 10663) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Downing;  
 A bill (H. R. 11199) granting a pension to Lewis Walton;  
 A bill (H. R. 11125) granting an increase of pension to John S. Campbell;  
 A bill (H. R. 11258) granting a pension to William F. Randolph;  
 A bill (H. R. 12019) granting an increase of pension to William Lowe;  
 A bill (H. R. 12214) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Tillinghast;  
 A bill (H. R. 12524) granting an increase of pension to Elvira M. Cooper;  
 A bill (H. R. 12963) granting a pension to Sarah E. Smith;  
 A bill (H. R. 12971) granting a pension to Thomas Martin;  
 A bill (H. R. 12991) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus S. Perkins;  
 A bill (H. R. 13239) granting an increase of pension to Ervin Thompson;  
 A bill (H. R. 13240) granting an increase of pension to Nimrod F. Clark;  
 A bill (H. R. 13358) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Wilder;  
 A bill (H. R. 13519) granting an increase of pension to James M. Clement;  
 A bill (H. R. 13534) granting an increase of pension to James Evans;  
 A bill (H. R. 13689) granting a pension to William W. Painter;  
 A bill (H. R. 13799) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Trout;  
 A bill (H. R. 13850) granting an increase of pension to Charles K. Cameron;  
 A bill (H. R. 13999) granting an increase of pension to Dennis Coster;  
 A bill (H. R. 14143) granting an increase of pension to Augusta W. Seely;  
 A bill (H. R. 14168) granting a pension to John B. Anderson;  
 A bill (H. R. 14253) granting a pension to Fletcher Duling;  
 A bill (H. R. 14302) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Burrell;  
 A bill (H. R. 14303) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Maricle;  
 A bill (H. R. 14407) granting a pension to May E. Bunn;  
 A bill (H. R. 14687) granting a pension to Margaret Brennan;  
 A bill (H. R. 14811) granting a pension to Almedia J. Robison;  
 A bill (H. R. 14814) granting a pension to Herman J. Miller;  
 A bill (H. R. 14889) granting a pension to James T. Lundy;  
 A bill (H. R. 14952) granting an increase of pension to Leonard S. Grove;  
 A bill (H. R. 14963) granting an increase of pension to Herman Tuerck;  
 A bill (H. R. 15084) granting a pension to James H. Powell;  
 A bill (H. R. 15211) granting a pension to Mary J. Slusser;  
 A bill (H. R. 15329) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Rosenbarger;  
 A bill (H. R. 15358) granting an increase of pension to John Snodgrass;  
 A bill (H. R. 15406) granting an increase of pension to James P. Campbell;  
 A bill (H. R. 15409) granting an increase of pension to James Claybourn;  
 A bill (H. R. 15472) granting an increase of pension to William H. Chamberlin;  
 A bill (H. R. 15550) granting a pension to Mary A. Hinkle;  
 A bill (H. R. 15585) granting an increase of pension to Solomon S. Shaner;

A bill (H. R. 15622) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Cardwell;  
 A bill (H. R. 15661) granting an increase of pension to James M. Marshall;  
 A bill (H. R. 15684) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Prentice;  
 A bill (H. R. 15693) granting an increase of pension to Delitha A. Cook;  
 A bill (H. R. 15694) granting a pension to Bessie Ledyard;  
 A bill (H. R. 15754) granting a pension to Frances Cowie;  
 A bill (H. R. 15839) granting an increase of pension to Luther Scott;  
 A bill (H. R. 15840) granting an increase of pension to Rudolph B. Weyeneth;  
 A bill (H. R. 15841) granting an increase of pension to John Da Salva;  
 A bill (H. R. 15864) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Knestrict;  
 A bill (H. R. 15889) granting an increase of pension to Chester W. Abbott;  
 A bill (H. R. 15892) granting an increase of pension to Eli Titus;  
 A bill (H. R. 15910) granting an increase of pension to James A. Hale;  
 A bill (H. R. 15961) granting an increase of pension to Jane C. Welch;  
 A bill (H. R. 15997) granting an increase of pension to Christian J. Flanagan;  
 A bill (H. R. 16032) granting an increase of pension to Henry Taylor;  
 A bill (H. R. 16058) granting a pension to John Corbett;  
 A bill (H. R. 16148) granting an increase of pension to Harry F. Libby;  
 A bill (H. R. 16162) granting an increase of pension to George Brown;  
 A bill (H. R. 16271) granting an increase of pension to Gustavus W. Peabody;  
 A bill (H. R. 16321) granting a pension to Michael Devine;  
 A bill (H. R. 16492) granting an increase of pension to Wilson G. Gray;  
 A bill (H. R. 16499) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Wainwright;  
 A bill (H. R. 16512) granting an increase of pension to John Dinneen, now John J. Davidson; and  
 A bill (H. R. 16711) granting a pension to Ann Gilbert.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Mrs. S. C. Sawyer, of Littleton, N. H., and a petition of sundry citizens of Holter, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the States power to deal with intoxicating liquors which may be shipped into their territory from other States; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BURNHAM presented a petition of Daniel Webster Grange No. 100, Patrons of Husbandry, of Webster, N. H., praying for the establishment of a bureau of public roads, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of Rev. J. Bunyan Lemon, of Manchester; of Rev. H. J. Rhodes, of Manchester, and of Mrs. S. C. Sawyer, of Littleton, all in the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of legislation granting to the States power to deal with intoxicating liquors which may be shipped into their territory from other States; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. KEARNS. I present a joint memorial of the legislature of Utah relative to the pending bill proposing to admit the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States into the Union. I ask that the joint memorial may lie on the table and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate joint memorial memorializing Congress to pass the omnibus statehood bill admitting Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States in the Union.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the governor and legislature of the State of Utah, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to pass the bill now pending in Congress to admit the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma as States in the Union.

EDWARD M. ALLISON, Jr.,  
 President of the Senate.

THOMAS HULL,  
 Speaker of the House.

Approved this 2d day of February, 1903. HEBER M. WELLS, Governor.

Mr. COCKRELL presented the petition of William Bailey, W. B. Austin, and sundry other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Huntsville, Mo., praying for the enactment



of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations and Government buildings; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PENROSE presented petitions of Lodge No. 158, of Wilkes-barre; of Lodge No. 110, of Pittsburg; of Lodge No. 147, of Philadelphia; of Lodge No. 75, of Philadelphia, all of the Order of B'rith Abraham, in the State of Pennsylvania, and of Lodge No. 197, Order of B'rith Abraham, of St. Joseph, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of 12 citizens of Friedensburg, of 23 citizens of Minersville, of 18 citizens of Hazleton, of 28 citizens of Dorrance, all in the State of Pennsylvania, and of 16 citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict immigration; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Young Men's Christian Association of the Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove; of the congregation of the Methodist Church of Selinsgrove; of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Sunbury; of the Armstrong Trust Company, of Philadelphia; of M. F. Umstead, of Philadelphia; of sundry citizens of Bellevue and Allegheny; of sundry citizens of Philadelphia; of Capt. C. S. Davis Post, No. 148, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, of Selinsgrove; of 39 citizens of Factoryville; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Millersville; of Rev. L. L. Overman, of Philadelphia; of Anna C. Boiver, of Philadelphia; of Ada Eyster, of Philadelphia, and of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Rochester, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Government buildings; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. McCOMAS presented a petition of Samuel Dorf Lodge, No. 160, Order of B'rith Abraham, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify the methods and practice pursued by the immigration officers at the port of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FRYE presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Kansas, relative to the ratification of the Panama Canal treaty; which was referred to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, J. R. Burrow, secretary of state of the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that the following and annexed is a true and correct copy of the house concurrent resolution No. 11, passed by the legislature of the State of Kansas, and is now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto subscribed my name and affixed my official seal. Done at Topeka, Kans., this 7th day of February, 1903.  
(SEAL.) J. R. BURROW,  
Secretary of State.

House concurrent resolution No. 11. By Mr. Adams, of Butler.

Whereas the Panama Canal treaty is now pending in the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas the speedy construction of the isthmian canal is of the greatest importance to this country: Therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring herein), That our Senators be, and are hereby, instructed to vote and work for the ratification of the Panama Canal treaty, now pending in the United States Senate, and that a certified copy of this resolution be sent to each of our United States Senators, to the President of the Senate, and to the President of the United States.*

The above resolution passed the house February 4, 1903. Was messaged to the senate February 4, 1903.

J. T. PRINGLE,  
Speaker of the House.  
W. P. MASON,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

The above resolution was received by the senate February 4, 1903. Passed by the senate February 6, 1903. Messaged back to the house February 6, 1903.

D. J. HANNA,  
President of the Senate.  
C. M. SHELDON,  
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. JONES of Arkansas on the 9th instant, proposing to appropriate \$80,000 for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of suitable stables for the Government Printing Office in the District of Columbia, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. FRYE on the 9th instant, proposing to appropriate a sum equal to two years' pay of a district superintendent of the Life-Saving Service for the widow and children of the late Joseph W. Ethridge, superintendent of the Sixth life-saving district, who died from pneumonia contracted in the line of duty, and proposing to appropriate a like sum for the widow of the late John M. Richardson, superintendent

of the First life-saving district, who died from sickness incurred in the line of duty, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12508) granting an increase of pension to James Jones, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 11388) granting a pension to William Vogan; and  
A bill (H. R. 833) granting an increase of pension to George H. Van Deusen.

Mr. MALLORY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported the following amendments, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and moved that they be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to:

An amendment providing for the establishment of a life-saving station at or near Half Moon Bay, south of Point Montara and near Montara Reef, California;

An amendment providing for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Cape Flattery or Flattery Rocks, on the coast of the State of Washington;

An amendment providing for the establishment of a life-saving station at Cape Nome, Alaska, and extending the Thirteenth life-saving district to include the coast of Alaska;

An amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for establishing light-houses and fog signals in Alaskan waters from \$200,000 to \$350,000;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for establishing a light-house and fog-signal station in Karquines Strait between San Pablo Bay and Suisun Bay, California;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$225,000 for the construction of a steam vessel of the first class for the Revenue-Cutter Service, to be stationed at Honolulu, Hawaii;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$40,000 for the establishment in the harbor of Oakland, Cal., of a depot for the Revenue-Cutter Service;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the establishment of a light-house depot for the Second light-house district in Boston Harbor, Massachusetts;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$30,000 for establishing a light and fog-signal station on the southeast end of Southampton shoal, San Francisco Bay, California;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,000 for the construction of a keeper's dwelling at Yaquina Head, Oregon, light station;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$4,500 for the construction of a keeper's dwelling at Cape Blanco light station, Oregon;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$5,000 for the construction of a dwelling for the light keeper at Grosse Isle, South Channel Range, light station, Detroit River, Michigan, and proposing to appropriate \$3,500 for the construction of a light-keeper's dwelling at Grosse Isle, North Channel Range, light station, Michigan;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$90,000 for the construction and equipment of a first-class steam light vessel for Blunts Reef, off Cape Mendocino, California;

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$15,000 to establish a fog-signal station and keeper's dwelling at Piedras Blancas light station, on the coast of California; and

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$125,000 for the construction of a steam tender for the Twelfth light-house district.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3635) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Oregon City, in the State of Oregon, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7051) to extend the limit of cost for the United States post-office building at Marblehead, Mass., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PENROSE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7243) to increase the efficiency and safety of the mercantile marine of the United States, and to appoint a commission to recommend to the Congress the revision of all laws of the United States relating to the construction, installation, and inspection of marine boilers and their appurtenances, and to suggest the enactment of such additional legislation as will effect improvement in construction of marine boilers and maintain uniformity of inspection of marine boilers in all portions of the United States and insular possessions, and to further provide a reciprocal recognition of boiler-inspection certificates between the several

maritime nations having marine-inspection laws, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to state that the report just made by the Senator from Pennsylvania from the Committee on Commerce is not unanimous, and that the minority of the Committee are not in favor of the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PATTERSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 14938) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Wilson; and

A bill (H. R. 15387) granting an increase of pension to Lott Van Nordstrand.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. TURNER on the 29th ultimo, proposing to appropriate \$2,000 to enable the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals to prepare a compilation of bills, reports, documents, and debates on the subject of an isthmian canal, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3214) to authorize the absentee Wyandotte Indians to select certain lands, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DEBOE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 9491) granting an increase of pension to John W. Brattain;

A bill (H. R. 4501) granting a pension to Sarah D. Lightfoot; and

A bill (H. R. 14217) granting an increase of pension to George M. Smith.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13674) amendatory of sections 3339 and 3341 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to internal-revenue tax on fermented liquors, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15793) granting an increase of pension to George Skinner, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KITTREDGE, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6443) for the relief of Patrick Nolan, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 10921) for the relief of Charles A. Cutler; and

A bill (H. R. 1517) for the relief of Robert Brigham.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1937) for the relief of the owner or owners of the barge *Charlie*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate a sum not to exceed \$306,000 to enlarge, remodel, extend, and improve the post-office and court-house building at Macon, Ga., etc., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

#### COURTS IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. BACON. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14764) to establish United States courts at Wilkesboro, N. C., to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RANK OF CERTAIN ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7298) to fix the rank of certain officers in the Army, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask that it may be put on its passage. It is a very short bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any second lieutenant of the United States Marine Corps who may have been appointed second lieutenant of artillery since the 2d day of February, 1901, and prior to the passage of this act, shall, in deter-

mining his lineal and relative rank, be entitled to the same credit for prior commissioned service as a lieutenant of volunteers appointed under the act entitled "An act to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States," approved February 2, 1901.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SENATE ELECTION CASES.

Mr. BURROWS, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House concurring), That there be printed 1,500 copies, in cloth, of the first volume of the new edition of the Senate Election Cases, compiled in pursuance of the resolution adopted by the Senate April 17, 1902, 500 copies to be for the use of the members of the Senate and 1,000 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives.*

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 7317) to provide for a medal of honor roll, and to place the persons named thereon upon the retired list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 7318) to provide for a medal of honor roll, and to place the persons named thereon upon the retired list of the Army;

A bill (S. 7319) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service to John McPherson (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7320) to correct the record of Henry Lippincott, assistant surgeon-general, United States Army (with the accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 7321) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Keefer (with the accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 7322) granting a pension to John C. Huntingdon (with the accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7323) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harkison (with the accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 7324) for the relief of Mrs. Emaline Johns; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 7325) for the relief of Herbert Cushman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 7326) to prevent robbing the mail, to provide a safer and easier method of sending money by mail, and to increase the postal revenues; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. MCENERY introduced a bill (S. 7327) for the relief of Louisa L. Bouillotte and Mrs. Lausa Minnie Price; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 7328) to authorize the appointment of Ricardo Iglesias as a midshipman in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 7329) to provide for the punishment of offenses upon the high seas; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HANSBROUGH introduced a bill (S. 7330) to authorize registers and receivers of United States land offices to furnish transcripts of their records to individuals; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

#### AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to establish the rank of staff sergeant-majors and staff quartermaster-sergeants in the Marine Corps, providing for appointments thereto, and making regulations in regard to their pay, allowances, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment relative to the pay of midshipmen, warrant officers, paymasters' clerks, and mates of the United States Navy when serving on shore beyond seas, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.



He also submitted an amendment authorizing any State, county, city, or corporation to improve any navigable river, harbor, or waterway at its own expense and risk, and providing for the repayment of the cost thereof when such improvement is approved and accepted by the Secretary of War, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the erection of a building on the Garfield Memorial Hospital grounds for heating, cooking, laundry, and electric elevator purposes, and for the erection and furnishing of new surgical rooms with modern appliances, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 for clerk hire in the office of the surveyor-general for the State of Minnesota, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 7142) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$152.45 for salary due A. E. Rose as receiver of the land office at St. Michaels, Alaska, from May 31 to July 7, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$250 to reimburse R. C. Nichols for expenses incurred in taking furniture and supplies for the Peavy land office from Seattle, Wash., to Peavy, Alaska, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

#### NAVIGATION LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

On motion of Mr. GALLINGER, it was

*Ordered*, That there be printed 1,000 additional bound copies of the Navigation Laws of the United States, edition of 1903, for the use of the Bureau of Navigation.

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.

Mr. HANNA submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 539) to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor, the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to insert in line 12, of the third paragraph of section 6, after the word "Interstate," the word "Commerce."

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 16656) to regulate the importation of breeding animals was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I ask the Senator from Illinois to yield for just a moment to me.

Mr. CULLOM. I withdraw the motion for a moment.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I had given notice that on to-day I would move to take up the bill (H. R. 3076) limiting the hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States or any Territory or the District of Columbia, thereby securing better products, and for other purposes. It is useless to antagonize the motion of the Senator from Illinois under the circumstances, and I give notice that at the earliest opportunity I shall renew that motion.

Mr. QUAY. In view of what has been stated by the Senator from Maryland, I desire simply to repeat the notice which I gave the other day, that I shall be compelled, when the Senator from Maryland makes a motion to proceed to the consideration of the eight-hour bill, to antagonize it with the statehood bill, unless the Senator from Maryland and those obstructionists with whom he is acting will agree to fix a day for voting on the statehood bill.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five hours spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 13, 1903, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12, 1903.*

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (junior grade) Rufus Z. Johnston, jr., to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 4th day of January, 1903, vice Lieut. William S. Smith, promoted.

Chief Engineer David Smith, United States Navy (retired), to be a chief engineer in the Navy, on the retired list, with the rank of rear-admiral, from the 3d day of March, 1899, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 5, 1903.

Capt. John R. Bartlett, United States Navy (retired), to be a rear-admiral on the retired list of officers of the Navy, from the 9th day of February, 1903, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved February 9, 1903.

*To be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant.*

Harold H. Haas.  
William H. Bucher.  
Edgar Thompson.  
Elon O. Huntington.  
John B. Dennis.

*To be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant.*

George P. Dyer.  
Robert H. Woods.  
Robert H. Orr.  
William A. Merritt.  
Franklin W. Hart.  
Harrison L. Robins.  
Webb V. H. Rose.  
William H. Doherty.  
Charles Morris, jr.

##### ASSISTANT NAVAL CONSTRUCTOR.

Richard H. Robinson, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 10th day of February, 1903.

##### ASSISTANT PAYMASTER IN THE NAVY.

Stewart E. Barber, a citizen of Maryland, to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, from the 18th day of February, 1903, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

##### SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

John W. Madison, of New York, to be surveyor of customs for the port of Port Jefferson, in the State of New York, vice Theodore W. Wheeler, resigned.

##### APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Algernon S. Badger, of Louisiana, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, vice Frank N. Wicker, deceased.

##### INDIAN COMMISSIONER.

William E. Stanley, of Kansas, to be a commissioner to negotiate with the Indians of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Muscogee (or Creek), and Seminole nations, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1893 (27 Stats., p. 645), vice Henry L. Dawes, deceased.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12, 1903.*

##### ASSISTANT TREASURER.

Charles A. Bosworth, of Ohio, to be assistant treasurer of the United States at Cincinnati, Ohio.

##### ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER PLENIPOTENTIARY.

Arthur M. Beaupré, of Illinois, now secretary of legation and consul-general there, to be envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary of the United States to Colombia.

##### SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Alban G. Snyder, of West Virginia, to be secretary of legation and consul-general of the United States at Bogota, Colombia.

##### TERRITORIAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICE.

Clinton F. Irwin, of Illinois, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Oklahoma.

##### CONSULS.

David R. Birch, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Malaga, Spain.

Hugh Pitcairn, of Pennsylvania, now consul at that place, to be consul-general of the United States at Hamburg, Germany.

Richard M. Bartleman, of Massachusetts, now consul at Valencia, Spain, to be consul of the United States at Cadiz, Spain.

## POSTMASTERS.

## ARIZONA.

Kasper Hauser, to be postmaster at Willcox, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona.

Benjamin Goldman, to be postmaster at Naco, in the county of Cochise and Territory of Arizona.

## GEORGIA.

William T. Rudolph, to be postmaster at Thomaston, in the county of Upson and State of Georgia.

James F. Boughton, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Morgan and State of Georgia.

## INDIAN TERRITORY.

David C. Blossom, to be postmaster at Atoka, in the Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory.

Charles B. Ramsey, to be postmaster at Davis, in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

Samuel S. Cobb, to be postmaster at Wagoner, in the Creek Nation, Indian Territory.

## KANSAS.

James M. Morgan, to be postmaster at Osborne, in the county of Osborne and State of Kansas.

George Delaney, to be postmaster at Axtell, in the county of Marshall and State of Kansas.

Thomas E. Thompson, to be postmaster at Howard, in the county of Elk and State of Kansas.

George J. Barker, to be postmaster at Lawrence, in the county of Douglas and State of Kansas.

Charles Smith, to be postmaster at Washington, in the county of Washington and State of Kansas.

## KENTUCKY.

Lizzie Vanpel, to be postmaster at Morganfield, in the county of Union and State of Kentucky.

John M. Green, to be postmaster at Pineville, in the county of Bell and State of Kentucky.

James P. Hutcheson, to be postmaster at Owenton, in the county of Owen and State of Kentucky.

George M. Dickey, to be postmaster at Cynthiana, in the county of Harrison and State of Kentucky.

## MISSOURI.

J. L. Fields, to be postmaster at Shelby, in the county of Shelby and State of Missouri.

## NEVADA.

William W. Booth, to be postmaster at Butler, in the county of Nye and State of Nevada.

## NEW JERSEY.

Aaron P. Kachline, to be postmaster at Frenchtown, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey.

Benjamin B. Ogden, to be postmaster at Keyport, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey.

## NEW YORK.

John H. McIntosh, to be postmaster at Canton, in the county of St. Lawrence and State of New York.

Edward C. Fisk, to be postmaster at Mayville, in the county of Chautauqua and State of New York.

Benjamin E. Jones, to be postmaster at Nunda, in the county of Livingston and State of New York.

George R. Cornwell, to be postmaster at Penn Yan, in the county of Yates and State of New York.

George G. McAdam, to be postmaster at Rome, in the county of Oneida and State of New York.

Gilmore O. Bush, to be postmaster at Tuxedo Park, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

Levi M. Gano, to be postmaster at Watkins, in the county of Schuyler and State of New York.

Everett I. Weaver, to be postmaster at Angelica, in the county of Allegany and State of New York.

Seraph E. Wolcott, to be postmaster at Keeseville, in the county of Essex and State of New York.

John J. Hodge, to be postmaster at Oneida, in the county of Madison and State of New York.

Thomas B. Gibson, to be postmaster at Walden, in the county of Orange and State of New York.

Frank W. Higgins, to be postmaster at Wellsville, in the county of Allegany and State of New York.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

John E. Crymes, to be postmaster at Waynesville, in the county of Haywood and State of North Carolina.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Harry Leighton, to be postmaster at Cavalier, in the county of Pembina and State of North Dakota.

Gustave B. Metzger, to be postmaster at Williston, in the county of Williams and State of North Dakota.

Agatha G. Patterson, to be postmaster at Bismarck, in the county of Burleigh and State of North Dakota.

Michael B. De la Bere, to be postmaster at Sheldon, in the county of Ransom and State of North Dakota.

## OHIO.

Aaron Brining, to be postmaster at Versailles, in the county of Darke and State of Ohio.

Van R. Sprague, to be postmaster at McArthur, in the county of Vinton and State of Ohio.

John L. Sullivan, to be postmaster at St. Marys, in the county of Auglaize and State of Ohio.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Alonzo D. Webster, to be postmaster at Orangeburg, in the county of Orangeburg and State of South Carolina.

## TENNESSEE.

Norvell L. Scobey, to be postmaster at Newbern, in the county of Dyer and State of Tennessee.

William F. Millican, to be postmaster at Rockwood, in the county of Roane and State of Tennessee.

John T. Hale, to be postmaster at Trenton, in the county of Gibson and State of Tennessee.

## VERMONT.

Stanley R. Bryant, to be postmaster at Windsor, in the county of Windsor and State of Vermont.

## WEST VIRGINIA.

Obe A. Petty, to be postmaster at Charleston, in the county of Kanawha and State of West Virginia.

## THE ALASKAN BOUNDARY.

The injunction of secrecy was removed from the proceedings of the Senate in connection with the consideration and ratification of a convention between the United States and Great Britain, signed on January 24, 1903, providing for the settlement of questions between the two countries with respect to the boundary line between the Territory of Alaska and the British possessions in North America.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 12, 1903.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we hallow Thy name and would glorify Thee in our lives. We thank Thee for Thy care over us as a nation and for the manifold blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us, especially in the great men "who have breathed their spirits into the institutions of our country; who have stamped their characters on the pillars of their age; who have poured their heart's blood into the channels of the public prosperity." We are forcibly reminded to-day of our beloved Lincoln, and we thank Thee for his intellectual powers, his warm, tender, loving heart, and that strong, rugged character which kept him amid the storms and conflicts of life to right, truth, and justice, "with malice toward none and charity for all." Help us to copy his virtues, that we may leave our tasks well done. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

## BRIDGE ACROSS THE CONNECTICUT RIVER AT HARTFORD, CONN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 7185) to authorize the board of commissioners for the Connecticut bridge highway district to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River at Hartford, in the State of Connecticut, which was privileged.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, is this the House bill that has been read?

The SPEAKER. It is the Senate bill that has been read.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I move the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move that the similar House bill lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the similar House bill will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. HENRY of Connecticut, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

## EFFICIENCY OF THE ARMY.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 15449, an act to increase the efficiency of the Army, and I ask that the statement only be read.



The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa calls up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 15449) and asks that the statement only be read and that the reading of the report be omitted. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

The conferees on the part of the House on the Senate amendments on H. R. 15449, an act to increase the efficiency of the Army, make the following statement:

Amendment No. 1 of the Senate, striking out the exception as to the general officers serving with the line, is agreed to with an amendment. It puts the general officers on the same basis as all the other officers of the general staff, and makes it so that none of them can be redetailed without service with the line except in case of emergency or in time of war.

Amendment No. 2: The conferees agree to the Senate amendment by inserting the word "of" after the word "or," so that it will read, "or of the Secretary of War under the direction of the President."

Amendment No. 3 makes the Chief of Artillery hereafter a brigadier-general. As agreed to in conference, it provides that the number of brigadier-generals of the line do not increase, and reduces the number of brigadier-generals of the line, exclusive of Chief of Artillery, after a vacancy shall occur in the grade of brigadier-general, to fourteen.

Amendment No. 4 is that provision of the bill as it passed the Senate embodied in section 6, and provided for the advance grade on retirement of certain officers who served during the civil war. The Senate recedes from its amendment on the ground that a provision is in the Army bill embodying the same principle.

J. A. T. HULL,  
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,  
WM. SULZER,  
*Conferees on part of the House.*

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 15449) to increase the efficiency of the Army, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 4.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2, page 3 of the bill, after the word "emergency," insert the word "or;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "or" of said amendment insert the word "of;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "and," in the second line of said amendment, insert the following: "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate," and after the word "brigadier-general," in line 3 of said amendment, insert the following: "and when the next vacancy occurs in the office of brigadier-general of the line, it shall not be filled, and thereafter the number of brigadier-generals of the line, exclusive of the Chief of Artillery, shall not exceed fourteen;" and the Senate agree to the same.

J. A. T. HULL,  
RICHARD WAYNE PARKER,  
WM. SULZER,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*  
F. M. COCKRELL,  
J. V. QUARLES,  
J. B. FORAKER,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Am I correct in understanding that the retirement feature, which was discussed so freely in the House, has been stricken out of the staff bill and is continued in the Army appropriation bill?

Mr. HULL. The Army appropriation bill has not yet been considered in conference, and no agreement come to on it. This is the only bill that we have had before us in conference so far, and in this bill as to the proposed retirement with advanced grade the Senate receded, so that it is entirely out of the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. This is the staff bill as it passed the House, substantially, the only difference being the promotion of the Chief of Artillery—

Mr. HULL. There are three amendments we agree to, two with amendments and one without amendment. The first amendment struck out the provision which allowed the general officers to serve without being sent back to the line for two years. The Senate cut that out and we agreed to it. It puts the general officers on the same basis with all the other officers of the general staff, and makes it so that none of them can be redetailed without service with the line except in the case of an emergency.

The next amendment was recommended by the Secretary of War in regard to the jurisdiction of the chief of staff by inserting the word "of" in the Senate amendment after the word "or," so that it will read "or of the Secretary of War under the direction of the President." The third amendment refers to the Artillery Corps and when the bill shall take effect.

The conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

HERMANN GAUSS.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. By direction of the Committee on Accounts I present the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 416.

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to Herman Gauss of the sum of \$500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Invalid Pensions as assistant clerk of said committee by detail.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in opposition to this resolution.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MADDOX. I would like to have a few minutes to be heard on this report.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. MADDOX. Twenty minutes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Can not the gentleman get along with ten minutes?

Mr. MADDOX. I could get along without saying anything, but I would like to have twenty minutes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I should be glad to yield to the gentleman ten minutes, if that will be satisfactory.

Mr. MADDOX. The gentleman himself has an hour, and I think I ought to have some time; I have something of interest to say upon this subject.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Personally, I should be glad to grant the time to the gentleman, but I am obliged to go away very soon, and I would be glad to have it as short a time as the gentleman can get along with.

Mr. MADDOX. Twenty minutes will not be much longer. I want to call the attention of the House to the acts of Congress.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. All right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HENRY C. SMITH] yields twenty minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX].

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before the House provides for the payment of \$500 extra to a clerk in the Invalid Pensions Committee. Who this clerk is I do not know. He may deserve this amount for all I know. But the fact to which I want to call the attention of the House, especially of those members who were here a year ago, is that at that time there was developed here a state of facts which, if not a scandal, was certainly no credit to the House of Representatives—a state of facts growing out of this very practice of allowing extra pay for services in this House. Gentlemen who were members at the time to which I refer will bear me out in that statement.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. MADDOX. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. This man is not on the pay roll of the House—

Mr. MADDOX. I understand that.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. And the law to which the gentleman refers does not apply to this gentleman. He is detailed by the Commissioner of Pensions to sit in the Committee on Invalid Pensions to protect as well the Government as to make fair report of the condition of special pension bills.

Mr. MADDOX. If he is sent here to take care of the interest of the Government, I should say that he is a mighty poor expert, judging from some of the pension cases which we have to consider here.

Now, let me ask a few questions. In the first place, what does this man receive from the Pension Office? What is his salary?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I am not certain as to that. I will ask the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY], the chairman of the committee, to answer that question. I think he is familiar with the facts.

Mr. SULLOWAY. His salary, as I understand, is \$1,200; I do not know with certainty, but I presume that such is the case.

Mr. MADDOX. The gentleman "presumes" that such is his salary.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. He is a regular examiner, and the gentleman tells me that the regular pay—

Mr. MADDOX. How long has he been serving here as an expert in your committee?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Personally, I know that since I have been here—in the Fifty-sixth Congress and in this Congress—he has been on duty, and I believe for some years previous.

Mr. MADDOX. Does he do any work at all in the Pension Office?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I understand that he does while Congress is not in session. By act of Congress he is detailed here during the sessions of Congress to look after special pension bills.

Mr. MADDOX. What I want to get at is this: What does he do during the vacation of Congress?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Well, when not employed here—

Mr. MADDOX. Is it not the fact—

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. When not employed in looking after

his duties here he performs the duties of an examiner in the Pension Bureau.

Mr. MADDOX. Is it not a fact that since he has been appointed here under an act of Congress he has not served a day in the Pension Office?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That is not the fact. And I want to say further to the gentleman that this clerk has been allowed one or two stenographers to assist him, and he has worked day and night during the Fifty-sixth and the Fifty-seventh Congresses—even on the Sabbath day, right along—to keep up with the work. There is not a more faithful officer in the United States than Mr. Gauss; and the same may be said of Mr. Porter, who occupies a similar position in connection with the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MADDOX. I do not know this gentleman, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. It is evident the gentleman from Georgia does not know what this clerk does, nor does he know the man; if he did, he would not make any objection to this resolution.

Mr. MADDOX. Now, listen to me a moment and answer this question: How many clerks have you in that Pension Committee?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I am not informed as to that. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SULLOWAY] can answer.

Mr. SULLOWAY. We have one clerk and an assistant, where there used to be five.

Mr. MADDOX. How about the two stenographers who have been waiting on this gentleman? Who pays them?

Mr. SULLOWAY. There is only one stenographer proper. The clerk and assistant clerk are both typewriters.

Mr. MADDOX. And they are waiting on—

Mr. SULLOWAY. The gentleman will pardon me a moment further. Mr. Gauss has been detailed from the Pension Bureau. He is on the pay roll at the Bureau as an examiner. His business here is, when papers come up, to go through them and analyze them. In one instance there was evidence to the extent of more than a million words. If the gentleman from Georgia had undertaken to examine those papers, I think he would have needed four weeks to go through them and satisfy himself. Now, this gentleman, by means of his knowledge acquired at the Bureau—his experience—goes through and analyzes such papers, and in a comparatively brief time he is able to make report upon them. During this Congress he has made 1,650 reports.

Mr. MADDOX. I do not want to have any more of my time consumed. I have now from the gentleman all the information I want. As I started out in my remarks to say, I do not know this gentleman; I do not know what duties he performs. I made that statement to begin with, but I do state that out of this very business grew a scandal, and we had to stop in the midst of the consideration of an appropriation bill in this House to appoint a committee of investigation, the chairman of which was the present Secretary of the Navy, and that committee was appointed to investigate just such things as we are now embarked upon in giving an extra allowance or extra pay to this man.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MADDOX. No; I do not want the gentleman to take up my time.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Just one question.

Mr. MADDOX. I will yield for that. I will ask the gentleman if he is on the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Yes; and I report this by authority of the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MADDOX. Then I have something for the gentleman to which I particularly wish to call the attention of the House. Go ahead and I will answer the question.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. The committee to which the gentleman refers, upon which Mr. Moody served, was in reference to a bill concerning the employees of the House, was it not?

Mr. MADDOX. I so understand.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. This man is not an employee of the House.

Mr. MADDOX. I understand where the gentleman can not be considered on the roll of the House, but at the same time this man was in that same batch, I guess.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. No; not at all.

Mr. MADDOX. At the same time of the extra payment.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. He is not an employee of the House.

Mr. MADDOX. He is an employee of the House by detail now. There is no question about that, according to the gentleman's own statement; by enactment of the House he is an employee. The proposition that we laid down then and the one that this House decided upon was that we would fix the salaries of these men and they would receive no more extra pay. No man can deny that, and we laid down certain rules which I wish to

have read, and I do not want to take up further time, except I want this House to hear those rules as they are read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines further to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow a suggestion?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I send these rules to the desk and I want the Clerk to read them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman sends to the desk a document which the Clerk will read in the time of the gentleman.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, these are the rules laid down by the House of Representatives controlling the employees of this House, and I ask the members of this House to listen to them and see what is required of the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter employees of the House of Representatives under the Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster shall only be assigned to and engaged upon the duties of the positions to which they are appointed and for which compensation is provided, except that in cases of emergency or congestion of public business incident to the close of a session of Congress or other like cause an employee or employees may be assigned or required to aid in the discharge of the duties of any other employee or employees, and in the discretion of the Doorkeeper not more than one folder may, if necessary, be assigned to do clerical work under the direction of the foreman of the folding room, but all assignments made hereunder shall be without additional compensation and shall not constitute the basis of a claim therefor.

It shall not be lawful to appoint or employ in any position under the House of Representatives more than one person at any one time, or to require or permit any such person to divide with another any portion of his salary or compensation while so employed.

It shall not be lawful to require or permit any person in the employ of the House of Representatives to sublet to another the discharge of any portion of the duties of the position to which he is appointed.

No person shall be appointed or employed as a page in the service of the House of Representatives who is under 12 years or more than 18 years of age; but this provision shall not apply to chief pages, riding pages, and telephone pages.

The Clerk, Sergeant-at-Arms, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster shall make certificate each month to their respective pay rolls, stating whether the persons named in such pay rolls and employed in their respective departments have been actually present at their respective places of duty and have actually performed the services for which compensation is provided in said pay rolls, and in each case where a person carried on such pay roll has been absent and has not performed the services in whole or in part for which payment is proposed, the reason for such absence and for such nonperformance of services shall be stated.

The violation of any of the foregoing provisions of law shall, upon ascertainment thereof, be deemed to be cause for removal from office.

It shall be the duty of the Committee on Accounts of the House of Representatives from time to time to inquire into the enforcement or violation of any of the foregoing provisions of law; and for this purpose they are hereby authorized to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths; and they shall report to the House at least once every session their compliance with the duty herein imposed.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say to the House that I have not volunteered to regulate the affairs of this House so far as these employees are concerned, but that investigating committee of which I spoke did not die with the last Congress; that is, the Fifty-sixth Congress. There was another one appointed, of which I am a member, and I feel that the duty devolves upon me to call the attention of this House to this question of extra pay for extra services. Gentlemen will see by what has been read—the law which was passed by this Congress—that it requires the Doorkeeper, the Sergeant-at-Arms—in fact, all of these departments—to make a report monthly when they make out their pay rolls; and it is the duty of the Committee on Accounts to see that these men make out these pay rolls and that these rules are complied with.

Now, the question is, Has the Committee on Accounts required all these reports to be made? So far as this single individual is concerned, whose case we are considering to-day, I do not know whether he deserves the extra pay or not. The question is whether he comes within the purview of the law, simply being detailed from the Pension Office to this House. That is a question I think the Representatives should decide for themselves. But this is the time when this question of extra pay begins. This is the time when these scandals begin to germinate, and I deem it my duty as a member of that committee to put the House on notice with respect to these extra payments which we may look for in the future. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD].

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I am in thorough accord with what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] has said as a general rule, but from personal observation I know that this particular individual earns very much more than it is proposed to give him here. Rules or no rules, I think that this particular clerk should have that amount which is asked for in this resolution. I believe that everybody who has been to that office will say that he is the most faithful and hardworked employee about this Capitol.

Mr. BENTON. Does the gentleman refer to Mr. Gauss?

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Yes. I say that he is always faithful, courteous, and ready to do his duty, and to my certain knowledge he earns every dollar here proposed to be paid him.



Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I wish to say that while I am in entire sympathy with the rule which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX] had read, and am in thorough accord with his position in reference to extravagance in public expenditures, I am satisfied the gentleman for whom this extra pay is asked does not come within this rule. As I understand it, he is detailed from the Pension Bureau. Of course he gets his salary there, but I am satisfied that his labors with the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and I have had some occasion to know something about them, are much greater than they would be at the Pension Bureau—that he very often devotes twice as much time to work on that committee during the twenty-four hours as he would be required to serve at his desk in the Pension Bureau. I am quite confident that that statement is correct.

Not only that, but his efficiency and thorough knowledge enable him to be of great service to the members of that committee. I do not suppose there is a member on that committee, though many of them have served for years, but who would admit at once that this gentleman has a much more thorough knowledge of the questions that arise there than any member of the committee, and that knowledge enables him to give information to the House touching pension bills which otherwise it would not be likely to secure. I should like very much to see him receive reasonable pay for his extra work. I do not know what that would be, but I think he is entitled to reasonable compensation for such extra service in addition to that which he receives as a clerk of the Pension Bureau.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Chairman of the Committee on Pensions [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER], I feel that I ought to say something to the House upon this proposition, because a similar resolution, I am informed, will be reported for the clerk detailed to assist the Pension Committee. I have been a member of that committee for eight years, and therefore think I am qualified to speak as to the services rendered by the clerk detailed from the Pension Bureau to assist it. He is something more than a mere clerk. He is something more than a mere writer of reports and an indexer of claims. He comes to that committee with a special knowledge of all the legislation upon the subject of pensions from the beginning of the Government.

This knowledge is required, for our committee handles not only the civil war pension cases, but all the pension cases of all the other wars—the Indian wars, the Mexican war, and the Spanish war, and the war of 1812. This clerk is to the Committee on Pensions what the expert parliamentary clerk is to the Speaker of this House. He is ready at all times to furnish information, accurate and correct, for the use of that committee in regard to existing laws. Not only that, but he takes every case that comes before that committee, every bill that is sent to that committee. It is indexed by him, and is briefed from all the papers on file, and a statement of the case in detail is rendered to the subcommittee man who has charge of that particular claim.

In addition to that, when the bill has been passed upon in the committee and has been ordered to be reported, this detailed clerk prepares the report which is submitted to the House, subject, of course, to the approval of the subcommittee man having the bill in charge. It has frequently happened within my knowledge that in order to get these reports prepared and upon the Calendar in time for action by this House this clerk has to work many hours beyond the time usually allotted to clerical work.

Mr. MADDOX. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BROMWELL. Certainly; with pleasure.

Mr. MADDOX. It was stated on the floor by the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that this gentleman whose case is now before the House asking for \$500 additional only drew \$1,200. I have just sent out and asked him, and he says his salary is \$2,000 a year.

Mr. BROMWELL. Well, I made no statement as to the salary.

Mr. MADDOX. I was just taking the time of the gentleman to make that statement. His salary is \$2,000 a year.

Mr. BROMWELL. If a mistake has been made, it is proper to correct it. But whether it is \$1,200 a year or \$2,000 a year, I want to say to this House that this gentleman is entitled to extra compensation. As soon as the House adjourns on the 4th of March he will report back to the Pension Bureau, and there he will earn his salary, whether it is \$1,200 or \$2,000, until the next session of Congress. When that session opens, he will return here for the long session.

Now, this matter of extra compensation is not a new one. It has gone on for twelve or fourteen years, and this House has allowed this extra compensation in recognition of services that these two expert clerks have rendered. They are not involved in

any of the scandal that has aroused the House, because they are not on the pay roll of the House. They are upon the pay roll of the Pension Bureau, and their salaries are paid out of the allowance made that Bureau, and neither one of these cases can come within the rule which the gentleman from Georgia has had read. That applies only to the officers of the House borne on the roll of the House. I state from my personal knowledge of the expert clerk of the Pensions Committee during the last eight years that this additional \$500 is but a small compensation for his services.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY].

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, the law read at the request of the gentleman from Georgia does not apply to these cases. You take Mr. Gauss, who serves as a clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and it must be evident to all that that man has to work almost night and day during a session of Congress to prepare these reports. He is a man of extraordinary ability, one who is worth probably from \$3,000 to \$4,000 a year, and he is detailed from the Pension Office to do this particular work. Now, it would be a great hardship for a man who works in the Pension Office from 9 until 4 to be detailed and work here almost continuously. The same is true of Mr. Porter, the clerk of the Committee on Pensions. These men must be men of extraordinary ability. They must understand their business. They are of great benefit to the members of these two committees, and for one I think these extra allowances ought to be made, and I hope the House will allow them.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. You reported this provision which has been just read in respect to the payment of extra allowances to the employees around the House. Do you consider that these men come under that provision?

Mr. HEMENWAY. They do not, in my judgment.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], and then I will ask for a vote.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, in that one minute I simply desire to say, with all due respect, that I am constrained to differ with my good friend from Georgia [Mr. MADDOX], whom I generally follow in these matters. In this case I think he is wrong. In my opinion, Mr. Gauss is one of the most efficient, one of the most industrious, and one of the hardest worked men in this House. His services are indispensable. If any employee is fairly and justly entitled to extra compensation for untiring additional work, it is he. The work he does is simply invaluable. He has reported over 1,650 bills and written the reports on them during this session of the House. We all know the time it takes to do that. His services to the members and the committee are continuous and indefatigable. He works for us night and day during the time Congress is in session, and he does it cheerfully, conscientiously, and always good naturedly. I say that the work Mr. Gauss does entitles him to additional compensation, that the amount asked for is reasonable, and I hope the House will give it. I shall vote for the resolution with much pleasure, because it is just and fair and proper, and a slight recognition of our appreciation of the great and magnificent work he has done.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote. The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

D. S. PORTER.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have another, concerning Mr. Porter, from the Committee on Pensions, precisely like the one just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman also calls up another privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 417.

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations is authorized to provide in the general deficiency appropriation bill for the payment to D. S. Porter of the sum of \$500 for extra and expert services to the Committee on Pensions as assistant clerk of said committee by detail.

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I yield to a question to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia first addressed the Chair.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDOX. I want about three minutes.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. And then you will answer my question?

Mr. MADDOX. I wanted to say to the gentlemen that while

differing with me they did not, it seems to me, know what they were differing about. Now, another thing that is singular that has grown out of this debate is that these gentlemen do not know the value of this man's services. They said that they understood his salary was \$1,200.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MADDOX. I sent out and inquired of him myself.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MADDOX. I have only three minutes.

Mr. BROMWELL. There was no statement made as to the salary of Mr. Porter at all.

Mr. MADDOX. I am not talking about him.

Mr. BROMWELL. You are talking about this other case. Mr. Porter gets \$2,000 as an expert clerk.

Mr. MADDOX. I was talking about the clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. It was said that he only got \$1,200 a year; and the idea is that this man is not upon the pay roll of the House, that he deserves this pay, and he is entitled to it. Of course gentlemen voted for it on the idea that he was drawing \$1,200 a year, and the \$500 would make his salary up to \$1,700 a year instead of \$2,500. That shows that you do not know anything about it. You do not know what you are talking about. Now, here is a man, and the statement is made to the House that he is drawing \$1,200 a year in the Department; and when we examine into it it is found that he is getting \$2,000 in the Pension Department—and you are making it \$2,500, and the House was agreeing to it, thinking it was making it \$1,700. That is the status of affairs, exactly. If he is entitled to \$2,500, I am in favor of giving it to him straight—straight; and we ought not to have these extra payments and extra allowances. We ought to make it permanent law. If this gentleman is to be hired and it is believed that he is entitled to \$2,500, if you gentlemen say you are in favor of it, I will vote for it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I understand it has been the custom for twenty years to give these two clerks extra pay.

Mr. MADDOX. Then I say that makes it all the more necessary that we should give it to them by a permanent law.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I agree to that.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word in reply to what the gentleman from Georgia has said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. If the gentleman will just wait a moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I simply wanted to say that the objection to the suggestion by the gentleman from Georgia is this. That the services may not be the same at each session of Congress, and they might grow much less. You can not tell. Another thing you may not always have as efficient an expert as you have now. I can testify as to the efficiency of each of these gentlemen; they are most excellent men for this work.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That is the very argument, Mr. Speaker, I was about to make in reply to the gentleman from Georgia. It is not a question of what the salaries of these men are while they are at work in the Bureau of Pensions. It is when the expert is detailed to do certain work here. The evidence before the Committee on Accounts showed the nature of that work, which is important to the committee for the protection of the Government, and he furnishes very valuable assistance to the members of Congress and assistance to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. After the Committee on Accounts had heard that proof it was not a question of whether he should receive extra pay, but what would be a fair compensation for the extraordinary services rendered in this House. In the Pension Bureau he works certain limited hours, and that is the end of it; but in the Committee on Invalid Pensions he works sufficient time to do what is necessary to do, and the committee are in favor of this resolution, and so reported it. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. This gentleman, as I understand it, is regularly employed in the Pension Bureau?

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. When he was employed, did he not, under the law, have this very work in view?

Mr. BROMWELL. Oh, no.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. He has a salary in the Bureau of Pensions, and by act of Congress he is detailed to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. He took the office with the salary that he had when he assumed the duties, and when he assumed the duties he had this work in view under the law. He assumed the office knowing that this work was to be done, and now after he does it he comes and asks extra pay.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Oh, nothing of the kind; he is doing nothing in the Pension Office now. The chairman of the

Committee on Pensions asked to have him detailed here under an act of Congress.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. That was his duty in anticipation when he assumed the office.

Mr. BROMWELL. The gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote. The question was considered, and the resolution was agreed to.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. CUSHMAN, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. DEEMER, for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. TAWNEY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 17202, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sequoia National Park: For the protection and improvement of the Sequoia National Park and the construction and repair of bridges, fences, and trails, and extension of roads, to be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, \$10,000.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 25, page 86, after the word "dollars," the words "to be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Crater Lake National Park: For protection and improvement of the Crater Lake National Park, and repairing and extension of roads, to be expended under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, \$2,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the committee some questions. On yesterday afternoon an amendment was adopted, in the nature of a substitute, for the amendment offered by my colleague in reference to the Rainier National Park, authorizing the Secretary of War to survey a road into that park, and appropriated \$10,000 for that purpose and for the purpose of constructing the road. Now, that was adopted late in the afternoon, just before the adjournment, and we did not have a chance to consider the effect of it. That does not make any appropriation for the park itself. The park is entirely and exclusively under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. The law reads in this way:

That said public park shall be under the exclusive control of the Secretary of the Interior, whose duty it shall be to make and publish, as soon as practicable, such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the care and management of the same.

The law requires him to look after the management of the park and after trespassers, and no appropriation is made covering a matter of that sort. The Secretary of the Interior sent a recommendation for an estimate to the committee and asked for \$3,000 for that purpose, and I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the committee, to what he says in his report. He says:

No regulations for the government of the park "for the preservation from injury or spoliation of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition," as required by the regulations, have been promulgated by the Department, as no appropriation has been made by Congress for the management of the reservation, and no superintendent could therefore be appointed to enforce such regulations. \* \* \*

Considerable interest having been manifested by the public in this park during the year, and a privilege for the transportation of tourists over the roads therein having been granted, it became necessary, in the interest of the Government, to have a representative of the Department therein. Accordingly, the forest superintendent for the State of Washington was placed in charge thereof temporarily. This assignment, however, can not be continued for any length of time without serious interference with the proper performance of the duties of this officer in the enforcement of the regulations of the forestry service in the State. Proper steps have been taken looking to the early survey and marking of the park boundaries. I have, therefore, submitted to Congress, through the proper channels, an estimate of an appropriation of \$3,000 for the management, protection, and the construction of necessary roads and trails in the Mount Rainier National Park during the ensuing fiscal year. It is earnestly recommended that favorable action be had thereon.

I wish to state that this forest superintendent has under his charge more than 6,000,000 or 7,000,000 acres of forest land in the State of Washington. As the Secretary of the Interior says,



it is practically impossible for him to give any attention to this park. His principal office is at Tacoma, a great many miles away; and he has to look after three or four different reservations in the State. I submit that the purpose of the law can not be carried out without some provision being made under which the Secretary of the Interior may select a superintendent, such as is provided for the park in the preceding paragraph. I ask the gentleman whether he can not consent to an amendment providing that the Secretary may take charge, as contemplated by the law, of this reservation. The substitute authorizes the Secretary of War to make a survey and construct a road to the park, but, as I said, it makes no provision for the care of the park itself.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well enough for us to conclude the reading of the bill without acting on this question; and in the meantime the gentleman can examine the subject, and I can also give it a little additional examination. It seems to me that if this park of which the gentleman speaks is to be improved we had better commence right. Our experience in the Yellowstone Park—and perhaps in other parks, but especially in the Yellowstone—has been with a dual jurisdiction under the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of War, which was not satisfactory. I do not mean to criticize the Interior Department; but Congress many years ago practically put the improvement and control of that park under the War Department. There is now in the Yellowstone Park a troop of cavalry; and from these, under proper discipline and control, better results can be obtained than by employing civilians under the Interior Department. In times of peace a troop of cavalry assigned for duty in Mount Rainier Park will not weaken the Army; and with the Engineer Corps to do the surveying and the construction of the roads, we shall, upon the whole, get better results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to say one word further, if I may be indulged.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. CANNON. I think we had better look over this matter; and as we have already passed the paragraph, we can return to it later as well as now.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. STEELE. I should like to ask one question. What is the distance from the place where this road starts to the park?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The road contemplated by the Department will be about 24 miles long, through a forest reservation. The national park is surrounded entirely by a forest reservation.

Mr. STEELE. What is meant by making a survey for this road; to see whether they can get to the park by the contemplated road?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They want to determine the best line on which the road can be constructed—to lay it out.

Mr. STEELE. Do they suppose that it will take \$10,000 to find which is the best route to the park?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no; the substitute provides for the survey, and after that has been made the balance of the appropriation will be used in the construction of the road.

Mr. STEELE. That is what I wanted to ascertain.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general repairs and improvements, \$25,000.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 23 insert: "For the following, under Government Hospital for the Insane, to be immediately available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and after due investigation, to install an electrical fire-alarm apparatus in the buildings at the Government Hospital for the Insane, or in such parts thereof as in his judgment may be required for the protection of the lives of the inmates of the institution from fire, and for the greater security of the buildings from destruction or damage by fire, \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. BARNEY. I move to amend the paragraph just read by inserting after the word "install," in line 21, page 89, the words "or place."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.: For introducing steam heat in barracks and hospital building, \$5,000.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after line 18, page 92, the words: "San Antonio Arsenal: New storehouse of enlarged capacity, \$70,550."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in drafting this amendment I have taken exactly the language submitted by the Chief of Ordnance with the approval of the Secretary of War. In support of this amendment I wish to read from the Book of Estimates the following quotation from the report of the Chief of Ordnance:

This building is very much needed for the safe storage of rifles, carbines, revolvers, and the equipment of the infantry, cavalry, and artillery soldier, together with the horse equipments for cavalry needed by troops serving in that region, and also for issues to the militia supplied from that point, as well as for the reserve supply of war material required to meet emergencies that might arise. In addition to the above, the building will provide space, not now available, but much needed, for storage of miscellaneous supplies required for issue to the adjacent fortifications of the Gulf coast.

WILLIAM CROZIER,  
Brigadier-General, Chief of Ordnance.

That is signed by William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance. Now, Mr. Chairman, the buildings at the arsenal at Fort Sam Houston, in the Department of Texas, are old and obsolete, tumbled down, and greatly in need of being repaired radically or replaced by new buildings. I myself had the honor of urging upon the Chief of Ordnance, General Crozier, that he go and personally see to the necessities of this arsenal. He made that personal inspection only a week or two before this Congress met, and this recommendation is based upon his own investigation.

That arsenal is not merely situated at the headquarters of the Department of Texas, but is in such reasonable proximity to the seacoast that it will serve as a distributing center to the seacoast protection fortifications; also for serving the various posts—and there are several of them—on the Mexican border. Previous reports of the Chiefs of Ordnance say that nowhere within the territory of the United States has any arsenal ever been found which is so well adapted to the preservation of most of the horse equipments and paraphernalia used in the Army, both in the cavalry and artillery. The necessity for it is manifest. It is urged by these gentlemen who have charge of equipping and providing our Army for the occasions of active campaigning, is strongly recommended by the Chief of Ordnance, has the approval of the Secretary of War, and I sincerely hope that the distinguished gentleman who presides over this committee will permit the items to go unchallenged.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I crave the attention of the committee while I submit a few facts about arsenals and about Army posts, barracks and quarters, etc. To start with, our project of seacoast defenses makes it necessary that in addition to the expenditure already swelling up to a hundred millions we appropriate from twenty-five to fifty millions more before it is complete, for guns and their emplacement. We have at each place to furnish barracks and quarters, officers' quarters, drill grounds, and a complete Army post to house the artillery forces that equip the guns, in order that, in the fullness of time, if we ever get into war, we will be enabled to use them in the public defense. It is impossible to tell how much is to be expended of this new expenditure for Army posts.

I guess I am within the limit when I say, first and last, thirty millions, making up between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000 for seacoast defenses. They begin away up in the State of Washington at the entrance to Puget Sound, on the Columbia River, go on down to San Francisco, San Diego, then around to the Gulf coast, Galveston, New Orleans, soon to be followed by perhaps one or two other places on the Texas coast where harbors are being made, then on to Florida, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, Norfolk, Baltimore, Washington, the Delaware, Philadelphia, and so on up the line to the coast of Maine—necessary expenditures for the public defense, needed, or believed to be needed now. Throughout the interior of the country, as emigration went westward and you had troubles with the Indians, Army posts upon the frontier were established.

Now, the Indian question is about settled, so far as war is concerned, and it is the hardest matter imaginable to get away from an Army post; it is like an office, almost impossible to discontinue when once made and it is almost impossible to get away from an Army post when it is once established or an arsenal when it is once established. Public service would be subverted if of the Army posts in the interior we could get away from two-thirds of them. We would do a great work, but of course ours is a representative government, and when one of us gets an arsenal or gets an Army post, the people like to have it kept and we imagine the necessity for it. Now, come to the question of arsenals. The whole thing has been revolutionized by difference in modes of warfare and the growth of the country, and the most of the arsenals now existing for which appropriations are submitted, and which the general appropriation covers as far as repairs are concerned, are worse than useless to the public service. Now, let me tell you what arsenals are required, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I think I can get through in five minutes. The Government is engaged in equipping the cavalry. This work is done at two arsenals. One is the Benicia Arsenal, on the Pacific coast, the only arsenal, I believe, on that coast. Some of this work is done there. That is 3,000 miles away from the Atlantic coast, and it has seemed to your committee that it is proper that the Benicia Arsenal on the Pacific coast is justifiable, but not more than that.

Now, at Rock Island there is a great arsenal that has cost \$12,000,000. I wish we had the money to-day, and with the changed condition of the public defense we could construct for \$6,000,000 much more and much better that is desirable than was constructed for the whole expenditure of \$12,000,000. But it is an island up there in the Mississippi, with this great plant, and used for two purposes—for equipment for artillery, saddles, harness for artillery, and so on. It would be quite sufficient without Benicia; but Benicia is on the Pacific coast, and some of that work is done there. Also at Rock Island there is a small-arms factory, which has just been equipped at great expense. Now, there is another small-arms factory at the great arsenal at Springfield, Mass. That is fully equipped. I wish that we were rid of Springfield or rid of Rock Island. If so, I would not vote to found another one. But we have them both fully equipped. In addition to that we have great quantities of people who make small arms, fully equipped, who could produce them for the Government in time of stress. But in time of stress even these two arsenals are quite sufficient to meet the public demands.

Then we have the arsenal at Watervliet. That is a gun factory, where they do assembling and work upon the high-power guns. Then you have here a gun factory at the navy-yard. The forgings and so on are done by private parties, mostly at Bethlehem. That factory is very well equipped with a great plant, and we get our forgings for less money than we could make them.

Then there is the Frankford Arsenal, over here at Philadelphia, thoroughly equipped for small ammunition. They put up the small ammunition there.

Now, I undertake to say, after full investigation, that these are all the arsenals that the public service needs.

There are a great many arsenals that in the development of the country it was supposed we needed. There is one at Indianapolis. And speaking respectfully of the Indiana delegation, I have had quite a hard time, or the Committee on Appropriations has had, and perhaps the Committee on Military Affairs has had as well in former years, to keep from making large expenditures at Indianapolis. The Government had no need for it. There was a valuable plat of ground right there in the city, as the city had grown out, and finally Congress waked up and the Indiana delegation then saw the propriety of those grounds being disposed of, and a disposition of them was authorized. I can not recollect all these arsenals. There is one at Schuylkill, Pa. There is no use on earth for it. It ought to be disposed of. There is one at Columbia, Tenn. There is no use for it on earth. There is one at Pittsburg, Pa. There is no manner of use for it. It is an expense to the Government.

Mr. DALZELL. It has been abandoned as an arsenal.

Mr. CANNON. Well, my friend says it has been abandoned as an arsenal. Certainly; but still there is the cost of maintenance. At Augusta, Ga., there is another in the same list. There is one in New Jersey; one at St. Louis, Mo.; one at San Antonio, Tex.; one at Kennebec, Me. I suppose there are as many more, if I could refresh my recollection. Now, what is this proposition? With a great expenditure being made for high-power guns and for a post for the seacoast defenses for that splendid city of Galveston, that has been destroyed by the sea, and yet which is to be a great city, from its location, and this expenditure is required. Now, here is the charming city of San Antonio, inland, and here comes my friend. I am not quarreling with him. If we could swap places and he could be from Illinois and in charge of this bill, and I could be from Texas, I apprehend that I should be arising in my place and offering this amendment of \$20,000 to build a storehouse.

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will permit me, I know he would, because then he would be advised of the necessity. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Precisely; I understand. But what is the necessity of a storehouse for an arsenal at San Antonio any more than at Pittsburg, or any more than at those other points? If it were utilized for manufacturing, it would have to be very differently equipped, if utilized by land and by sea. With our 200,000 miles of railway, it is indicated that we should have a few plants as perfect as possible, and then in a short time the supplies can be distributed. Now, I submit to my friend that, as I believe from investigation, this appropriation ought not

to be made. My friend says, "Ah, but we got an estimate." Why, yes; there is no trouble about an estimate. How do they arise? Why, the man who is in charge of a post or in charge of an arsenal; that is his specialty. He lives there, and he meets the good friends, and properly so. They think something else ought to be done; and we all magnify our present surroundings.

He starts an estimate, and it comes up to the commander and it is blessed, and it comes up to the Quartermaster-General and to the Chief of Ordnance and it is blessed again, and pro forma blessed by the Secretary of War, and then the law requires the Secretary of the Treasury to send it up in the shape of an estimate. I will tell you about estimates. I have had some experience; not as much, I apprehend, as many gentlemen who are listening to me. Somebody said once, some years ago, he would make a wager that he could get a petition to hang the governor or lieutenant-governor—I think General Palmer was governor at that time, and afterwards Senator—and the wager was taken. He drew up his petition, signed it himself, and every member and senator, and that is 203, signed it, and he won his wager.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Are you certain they did not read it?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not think General Palmer needed hanging, and still, whether he did or not, he was entitled to trial. [Laughter.] So it runs, a lively Representative or Senator, that is lively and persists and pushes, to get rid of him they give an estimate, and throw the responsibility upon Congress. That is an easy way of getting rid of a persistent, pestiferous Representative.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. A moment more. I submit that we ought not to spend this \$70,000 for this storehouse and make further improvements at that or any of these arsenals other than the ones I have mentioned. I would be glad to know, without having conversed with the gentleman about it, what the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who has had much more Army experience than I have, and he knows about the public service—I would be glad to ask him his views about it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, if I were not conscious of the fact that the merit of this proposition would win it, if I could command the same attention which is always granted the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, so that my cause might be properly put before the House, I should throw up the sponge now, because I admit that I am decidedly outclassed in the debate. But, sir, I want the House to understand, as the gentleman himself has admitted, that it is stamped with the approval of the military officers, who have technical knowledge of the situation. The Chief of Ordnance himself personally investigated it, and after personal investigation he recommends that this item be kept in. The gentleman addresses his argument to certain types of arsenals, certain manufacturing arsenals, and stated that we had no need of others, perhaps, than those at Rock Island, Benicia, and at Springfield. I think I quote him correctly in that. The plant at San Antonio is not intended to serve any such purpose as those arsenals. But there is a great military division of this Government known as the Department of Texas. Its headquarters are at the city of San Antonio, and in the arsenal at that place there are stored the necessities for the equipment of the Army.

Mr. Chairman, if we were to always have peace there would be no need for an arsenal nor would there be need for an Army; but it behooves us in time of peace to prepare for emergencies that may come. Now, the city of San Antonio happens to be the headquarters of the Department of Texas and its large field of military operation. This arsenal is located more than 1,200 miles from Rock Island, more than forty-eight hours away by express trains, and three to four weeks by ordinary freight carriage. It is necessary that the equipment of arms and leather goods and supplies of that sort should be kept in the arsenal to be distributed here and there in Texas and on the Gulf coast. It is merely intended to maintain a great storage arsenal there. San Antonio is about 150 miles from the frontier of Mexico and about 150 miles from the Gulf of Mexico. It is quite certain, sir, at least to my mind it seems clear, that if we are to have any military disturbances in the near future they will be to the south of us.

The importance of that country diplomatically and commercially is going to increase very greatly. We are going to expend a large sum of money in the construction of a canal connecting the Pacific and the Atlantic oceans. The dangers of proximity are not to be overlooked. Increasing social, business, and political intercourse with the people of the Central and South American countries makes it necessary for us to maintain a means of quick military equipment in the South. The Southwest has no other arsenal than this. It is almost as near to San Diego and the Pacific coast as Rock Island is to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that gentlemen who have technical knowledge and who have personally investigated, who have no interest in the matter but the promotion of the interests of the



Government and the maintenance of the efficiency of the Army, are better entitled to have their opinions respected by this House than even the eminent gentleman from Illinois, however great may be his abilities, when he has no personal knowledge of it. I would be very glad if, after this Congress adjourns, he would take time to visit the State of Texas and acquaint himself with the dimensions of that great State and, by personal investigation, with the military necessities which he talks about so positively upon the most casual investigation. I hope, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that if the House will consider this amendment carefully and fairly it will go into the bill.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I have no personal knowledge as to this particular appropriation, but I do want to very cordially indorse what the gentleman from Illinois has said as to the multiplication of arsenals over the country. I should imagine from the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that this appropriation is more for a storehouse than for an arsenal. I understood the gentleman to say that it is a great place to keep supplies and equipments of cavalry.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. With the permission of the gentleman, I want to state that in the amendment I have offered it says storehouse. There has been one there for more than fifty years. As a military strategic point of importance San Antonio is noted in the history of our country. It was a place of importance in the Mexican war, and also when it was proposed to interfere with Maximilian in Mexico, when another army was rendezvoused there and an arsenal established, and it is not proposed to do anything new.

Mr. HULL. I understand that. The amount that is necessary, it seems to me, can be assigned out of the appropriation for barracks and quarters for the different posts.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say to the gentleman that there is an arsenal there established by law, and that this is a part of it and has no proper connection with the appropriations for posts and barracks.

Mr. HULL. I am of the opinion that in the military bill and in the bill now under consideration there are appropriations for barracks and quarters and that these bills make larger appropriation for that purpose than any Congress for the last twenty years. I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if that is not true.

Mr. CANNON. That is true.

Mr. HULL. If that is so and this is simply a storehouse, it seems to me the gentleman from Texas, or any gentlemen representing arsenals that are not real arsenals, but only part of a post, if it is necessary for these different posts to have storehouses, can get an assignment out of those appropriations. In other words, we appropriate the money in gross in the appropriation bill. In the Army appropriation bill we give \$4,750,000, and in this bill an aggregate of nearly \$2,000,000 to barracks and quarters.

Mr. CANNON. Twelve hundred thousand in the special appropriation and a special provision of about a million more.

Mr. HULL. The total appropriation is so large that it does seem to me that if the Department recognizes the necessity at any post for a good storehouse, they can assign the money and have plenty to carry on the Government business without crippling any of these interests. I am not going to express an opinion as to whether this storehouse is needed or not. Upon that point I yield to the superior wisdom of the gentleman from Texas, but it seems to me that if it is needed, that the large appropriations carried in the two bills, the sundry civil and the military bills, there ought to be no trouble in securing that amount of money.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that that is an arsenal established by law, and that this item, being specific and necessarily for the arsenal and not for a post, is bound to come in under a specific appropriation.

Mr. HULL. I do not understand that there is any manufacturing there. My understanding is that it is not so much an arsenal as it is a storehouse—a storehouse to keep supplies and equipment for the Department of Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And ordnance stores.

Mr. HULL. Yes; I suppose you might call saddles ordnance stores, and at the same time they have storehouses at every post where they keep saddles. I can see no reason why every department—the Department of Texas, the Department of the Lakes, and the Department of Missouri, and all these places—can not have the storehouse on the same line for the use of the department; and it seems to me, if this is necessary, that ample power is given to the Secretary of War in the allotment of these funds to provide exactly for what the gentleman from Texas desires.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The ally of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, insists on confusing posts with arsenals. All that I have to say about that is that the item was recommended by the Chief of

Ordnance, and it can not come from the appropriation for posts and barracks. It is necessary for an arsenal that has been established for sixty years, and I hope the House will give me the item.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SLAYDEN) there were—ayes 44, noes 48.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not question the Chairman's knowledge of figures, but this vote is so close I shall have to demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

The House again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 66, noes 71.

So the amendment was lost.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment which I desire to offer—to insert on page 92, after the pending paragraph, the following:

San Antonio Arsenal, new boundary fence, \$10,500.

All I have to say in support of this amendment is that it has been recommended by the Chief of Ordnance, after personal investigation upon the ground.

Mr. CANNON. And all I have to say is that if it is necessary to make any repairs there the general appropriation for such purposes is available.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. SLAYDEN was rejected.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I desire to offer one more amendment:

Amend by inserting on page 92, after the pending paragraph, these words: "San Antonio Arsenal: New storehouse for lumber and unserviceable ordnance stores, \$8,000."

In connection with this item, Mr. Chairman, I should be glad if members of the House would read the language of the Chief of Ordnance in making the estimate and recommending this appropriation. Those stores are now protected by a temporary shed, made by taking the old roof from an abandoned building and setting it upon some posts, temporarily placed, for protecting the property of the Government. Certainly the generous chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will admit the necessity of an item like this.

Mr. CANNON. If this work be necessary, the general appropriation will be available. As to the stores that have been abandoned, it seems to me the quickest and best proceeding is to destroy them and get rid of them. They will never be of any use to the service. What is the use of expending money in taking care of them?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Possessing a certain value, they have to be taken care of until they can be disposed of.

Mr. CANNON. I think the general appropriation is available for this purpose, if such an expenditure be justifiable. But I am against the amendment, because I do not think we ought to spend any more money on these things which ought to be abandoned.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. SLAYDEN was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Executive Mansion: For care, repair, and refurnishing of Executive Mansion, \$60,000, to be expended by contract or otherwise, as the President may determine.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON] why the appropriation embraced in this item is so much in excess, as I am informed and believe it is, of what has been appropriated for this purpose heretofore. My information is that the amount last year was \$25,000; now the proposed expenditure is \$110,000. Why should there be such a difference between the expenses last year and the expenses for the incoming year?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation for the current year is \$25,000, with a very considerable deficiency appropriation to follow, the exact amount I do not recollect. The committee looked into this matter very carefully. As the gentleman is aware, there have been during the present year very large improvements made to the Executive Mansion. In addition to that, a building has been constructed under the authority of Congress for executive offices. Now, for the enlargement of the Executive Mansion and for the support of the building, and for the officering of the new offices, there is required an additional expenditure.

These estimates were made very thoroughly and very closely by the present superintendent of public buildings and grounds, Colonel Bingham, who, after full investigation, has recommended as necessary the sum embraced in this item.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman kindly inform me what this expense is supposed to cover?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, it covers fuel; it covers light; it covers necessary people to care for the buildings; it covers the necessary increase of employees. As the gentleman is aware, the

Executive Mansion, as well as the new office building, is, like department buildings, officered and cared for at the expense of the General Government.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, we all know, of course, that as we expand and enlarge as a Republic expenses increase. I have sought to get from our encyclopedia of information, the gentleman from Illinois, some information as to what this appropriation covers; what does it pay for? What items? We are asked very often what this item covers; in other words, whether the President pays any part of the expenses pertaining to the White House. I have before me an official letter received a few moments ago from Colonel Bingham, transmitted by him to the Secretary of War, and through the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the committee, in which I find this language:

The last appropriation for making repairs and furnishing the Executive Mansion was \$25,000. It has since been necessary to ask for \$10,000 in addition thereto for the current year on the general deficiency bill, which makes a total of \$35,000; and changes may have yet to be made in tank and filter.

Now, then, it goes on a little further, but I have not time to read it all. I continue:

More help will be needed in the laundry, owing to the large family which occupies the White House and the large amount of entertaining done by the President, which increases the use of table linen, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I read further, Mr. Chairman:

7. As the conservatory of the old house has been abolished a considerable amount of expense for labor and hauling is necessary to decorate the house, which now has to be done from the propagating gardens, a mile away.

The former estimate for labor and incidentals connected with the winter entertainments at the White House must have a considerable increase, because the President is doing a large amount of entertaining. Also owing to the abolition of the conservatories and greenhouses, flowers have, from time to time, to be purchased for the winter entertainments beyond what can now be furnished by the propagating gardens.

On page 2 they are shown to amount to \$110,264—an "increased estimate." Mr. Secretary Root says as follows:

Improvement and care of grounds.....	\$9,400
Repairs, fuel, etc., Executive Mansion.....	80,000
Lighting, etc., Executive Mansion.....	20,864

Total..... 110,264

Enlarging the White House, as I have already stated, of course necessarily increased expense follows, but I can not get myself up to that pitch of generosity with public funds to feel that we are justified in expending \$110,000 in this way as against \$25,000 last year.

I can not agree to appropriate public funds to that amount to provide for the contingency referred to by General Bingham when he says that the President is doing a large amount of entertaining, and hence this money is needed. If this has been the case heretofore, then I want what I say to apply all along down the line, clear down to Andrew Jackson, if you please. I say that this Government ought not to be called upon to take the tax money of this country and pay for this continuous, endless chain of entertainments.

I have been informed that General Bingham is no longer to enjoy the high distinction of being a charming adjunct to the White House entertainments. He is a gentleman so far as I know, a man of integrity I presume. Why he leaves the White House I do not know. I am dealing with his words.

Mr. Chairman, with the gilt-edge record for reform and retrenchment of the distinguished son of Illinois [Mr. CANNON] it does look to me as if we ought to distinguish ourselves in seeing that there is retrenchment along these lines. We have already expended \$600,000 in changing the old White House into the new White House, and I for one wish that it had not been done. I loved the old place. I wanted it kept in statu quo. I wanted it made an office for the President and, if need be, go out on some splendid hillside and build a President's mansion.

I opposed the proposition to expend \$600,000 in that way, and with anguish, with absolute pain, I regret that we have a tunnel on one side of the White House and a coal house on the other, also some other affair that I think detracts from the beauty of the old White House, a spot which is sacred to every true American, a spot of sunshine which I would have ever linger unfaded. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, it is so easy to criticise and find fault. It is so remarkably easy to get up and occupy five or ten minutes and then run the time up longer in criticism of something. The last Congress authorized this expenditure at the Executive Mansion. It seemed to me it was wise then and it seems to me now that it was wise. It may be that the eminent architect

who planned it and under whose direction it was executed made mistakes. Architects are prone to make mistakes, and after all you can not do any great public work without some mistakes. I have no great pride myself in most of them, and I have sometimes thought that I would gladly contribute to help raise a million dollars to assassinate large portions of them. [Laughter.]

I am not here to defend them, but I am glad that the White House was overhauled. I am not so very glad that that office building was erected. We were entitled to a better building for the money, but I think there was too much architect, so far as that building is concerned. Now, the President of the United States is elected sometimes by one party and sometimes by the other. Most of the times he has been elected the Republicans have elected him, and when the Republicans have not elected him, in the last analysis the Democrats have been sorry that they did not, in the end. [Laughter.] Let that be as it may, he is our President, and after all the entertainments at the White House are our entertainments.

Eighty millions of people, the richest nation on earth, growing, waxing great and strong from every standpoint. And if you will consider the fact that our expenditures mount up to nearly \$700,000,000 a year, and if you will take this bagatelle for the expenditure at the White House, for all the people, our White House, our entertainments, I think my friend when he gets down upon the hustings in the Nashville district will not find many admiring constituents who will agree with him in his criticisms of that expenditure. If I had to follow him I would say, however, that through all the Presidential terms there have been more or less men in the House or the Senate of a criticising mind.

I was walking with an eminent citizen one day, a Representative of the State of Tennessee then in Congress, who told me that he was here during Jackson's Administration. As we walked along to the rear of the White House, south of the White House, that passageway then being open, he said: "Stop a minute, Mr. CANNON. Do you notice any peculiarity in this landscape here?" "Why," said I, "it is very beautiful. It is covered with green turf, splendid to the eye. I am glad it was made that way. Why do you ask it?" Said he, "It was made that way in Jackson's time and under Jackson's direction." "Well," I said to him, "Old Hickory did a pretty good job." "Yes," he said, "but do you know that all through a Presidential campaign the shape of this landscape here was a matter of attack in the opposition papers all over the country, and they said that the President had caused that landscape to be made there in similitude to the form of his mistress." "Why," said I, "you surprise me and astound me." "Oh, well, it only shows," he said, "how some of the American people at times and under certain conditions run amuck." I just wanted to call the attention of my criticising friend to the fact that he did not invent this line of criticism.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will my friend yield for a moment?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Did your friend who was walking down Pennsylvania avenue with you inform you that during any term of Andrew Jackson the expenses of the White House increased from \$25,000 in one year to \$110,000 the next year?

Mr. CANNON. Nay, nay; he did not.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Well, I come from his district—

Mr. CANNON. And I will inform the gentleman that during Jackson's Administration there were less than 15,000,000 people in the United States. It was before the day of railroads. Now there are almost 80,000,000 of us, and I will inform him that we pay for pensions alone to the defenders of the Republic almost five times as much as the total expenditures under Jackson's Administration.

Mr. VANDIVER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

The time of Mr. CANNON having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I will take just enough time to answer my friend's question.

Mr. VANDIVER. Referring to the office building connected with the White House, will the gentleman inform us how much it has cost?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know precisely what it has cost. I believe \$60,000 was appropriated. How much of it was expended I do not know.

Mr. VANDIVER. I do not wish to be understood as objecting to it at all. I think, in fact, it ought to have been built, and a much better one built.

Mr. CANNON. So do I.

Mr. VANDIVER. But just in that connection, having taken a brief survey of it, I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois for which purpose he thinks it is best suited—a Presidential executive office or a carriage barn or a chicken coop?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will refer the gentleman to the architect who, I understand, planned it. I believe his name is McKim.



I think he is one of the three created by the Senate to get up this parking plan, you know, generally. I do not care about defending that thing. It can not be defended.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no desire to criticize the increased expenditures for entertainment or for living at the White House; but although it may seem indelicate to criticize the President or to insinuate that the king—or the President—can do wrong in this country, it does seem appropriate to call attention in a very emphatic manner to what has occurred in the alleged improvements on the White House grounds. In the last session of Congress some \$600,000 were set aside to improve the White House and to erect an office building. I have yet to find a single member of this House who can justify the expenditure of \$65,000 for the erection and furnishing of what is called the "Executive office" on the White House grounds.

Some \$475,445 have been expended in remodeling and improving the Executive Mansion. I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to a dispatch contained in the New York papers to-day, and which merits some attention from this House. In connection with the removal of Colonel Bingham as superintendent of public buildings and grounds in this District the New York papers of to-day charge that one of the reasons assigned for his removal or transfer is the fact that he is holding up certain vouchers because the work has been done in an improper manner.

If that be true, it is something, it seems to me, that the gentleman and his committee should take notice of. I would put the newspaper dispatch in the RECORD were it not for the fact that it also refers to certain matters that it does not seem appropriate to bring in here. The White House in its present shape disappoints men who have been longest in this city. In round numbers it has cost \$600,000 to remodel the White House and to put up the office building, and the reason for the disappointment, in my opinion, comes from the manner in which this improvement was authorized. I have always been strongly opposed to giving any executive officer, no matter how exalted the position he holds, the right to expend, without limitation or without restraint of any kind, the public moneys of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The White House improvements and the Executive building is an emphatic argument in favor of discontinuing that method of legislation.

The item now before the committee is for something more than "care" of the White House. The language of the provision is:

For care, repair, and refurnishing of Executive Mansion, \$60,000, to be expended by contract or otherwise, as the President may determine.

I ask the gentleman in charge of this bill how much repair, how much refurnishing, is to be done in the coming fiscal year at the White House after \$600,000 has been expended putting it into shape? If this money is to be used merely for the care of the White House, it should be so stated; and at the risk of giving offense even to the President, or to some of his friends, I will state that in my opinion it is not proper to give him authority to expend as he may please any part of this money for the refurnishing or repair of this building. I see in the New York papers—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague may be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that the time of his colleague may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The New York papers state to-day that one of the reasons for the removal of Colonel Bingham is the fact that he is—I will read just this portion of the article—the other part refers to matters which in my opinion ought not to be brought into this debate:

The reason of Colonel Bingham's fall from grace has been his persistent opposition to the plans and methods of reconstructing the White House. At present certain vouchers are held up because the superintendent of public buildings and grounds is not satisfied with the character of the work and demands that certain defects be remedied. This has irritated the Secretary of War, who recommended the architects, and Colonel Bingham's friends have known that in consequence he would soon be assigned to active duty.

While I can not pride myself upon the fact that I am included in the circle known as Colonel Bingham's friends, a statement like that in the public press, affecting the improvements made at the White House under the personal supervision of the President of the United States, should not be permitted to go unchallenged in this House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him? Will he be fair enough to state that it is at his own request that this officer has been transferred and with no ill feeling whatever?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know that public officials are often inclined to make that statement whenever their superiors are under

suspicion of coercing them. In fact, it is well understood that gentlemen under such circumstances are expected to do it.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Especially Army officers.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What could an Army officer of the United States who has incurred the displeasure of his superior officers do but to accept the inevitable and go wherever it is suggested he go? He knows his limitations. He is in the service of the United States, and we know from experience that a man can not afford to antagonize those who are in power and in control.

Mr. BROMWELL. If the gentleman will permit me, I suppose he is aware that the engineer officers of the United States Army have only limited tours of duty in particular locations, at the end of which they are changed to other locations, and that in the course of transferring officers it has come to Colonel Bingham's time to be sent to another location.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The circumstances surrounding this transfer are the most emphatic answer that can be made to the suggestion of the gentleman. Here is this charge, which reflects, in my humble judgment, upon the President of the United States. I am not in a position to speak for the President or for the Administration. There may not be anything in this charge, but such a charge ought not to remain uncontradicted. Such charges can be prevented by removing the cause of them, and that is to take from the President the discretion of expending this money as he pleases. I would be sorry to confess that it was the taste of the President of the United States that was responsible for the present monstrosity on the White House grounds. [Applause.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, the item under consideration raises a question of importance. The amount involved is not large, and even were it very much larger, if necessary to the comfort or to the convenience of the President it would be ungrudgingly expended. The taxpayers of this country are disposed to provide for their public servants emolument sufficient to guarantee to them a generous living, and something more, and respectable surroundings at this capital. Unquestionably the people take pleasure in lavishly maintaining their Chief Executive in that exalted social station which becomes the Chief Magistracy of this great Republic. But, Mr. Chairman, the tendency to vulgar display in society, found everywhere, is rampant in this capital, and official circles are not exempt from it. This tendency needs no help at our hands, and in so far as we recognize anything that promotes it we propagate an unmixed evil.

The attempt to imitate and follow the fashions of the courts of Europe in official circles here has grown, and grown, and grown, until we hear it urged that in order to insure the maintenance of the pace set by it in official circles public servants must be prepared to spend enormous sums in entertaining. We are told that this or that public official can not live on the salary he is now receiving, although that salary is far greater than it was during the civil-war period, when living was far more expensive than now. I am of the opinion that some of our officials are underpaid, but I am not prepared to sanction salaries based upon the exactions of a social life reflecting the luster and ambitions of the suddenly rich or the prodigally extravagant people who have little on hand except what we call "social functions."

Social life at the capital fifty years ago and until recently offered to the world an example of refinement and culture of which no American was ashamed, and I do not think that the numerous frills and follies that have been added have improved matters. I am not favorably impressed with the all-pervading odor of flunkysm which now goes current as the only patent of gentility. [Applause.]

It is true that many things heretofore unknown are now deemed essential to comfort. There has been a great improvement in the standard of living and in the facilities for the ornamentation of our homes. The effects are seen everywhere, and they are something to be thankful for. The people are in the enjoyment of these blessings, and they are entirely willing to provide them for their servants.

They know that the members of the Congress can not get on as well with the salary they now receive as those who went before them could on a smaller salary. But the fact that the standard of living has changed does not justify the expenditure of forty or fifty thousand dollars of public money annually in empty display in the President's household or anywhere else.

At the President's receptions, up to forty years ago, the doors of the White House were thrown open to everybody in sight. In whatever apparel they happened to wear, rich and poor alike were admitted. This method was necessarily abandoned. The increased population of the great capital was a sufficient reason for its abandonment. Now it is impossible to accommodate the great number the President would desire to invite to his household. I do not believe that prodigal expenditures and lavish display at White House functions are in good taste. I do not

believe the small number of people who attend them are impressed by it. They go there to honor the Chief Magistrate.

When our constituents visit us here, or when citizens of a State having a Cabinet officer or justice of the Supreme Bench accept an invitation to his house, they go and probably pay tribute to his honorable station with no thought or admiration of the flunkymism which has crept into the social life of the capital. [Applause.]

It is not palatable to the average American citizen to be told that in Washington the exactions of society become such that no man can accept high office unless he can live at a pace set by those who have money to burn. I do not believe that official salaries or allowances or the methods of living and entertaining in official circles should be based on this scale of living. Public officials of high and low degree should simplify social customs at the national capital instead of demanding an increase in salaries. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Just a word, Mr. Chairman, and then I shall ask to continue the reading of the bill.

Answering the gentleman from New York, the engineer officer now superintendent of public buildings and grounds was detailed under the Administration of President McKinley. He has occupied his present position over six years. His predecessor was another member of the Engineer Corps, General Wilson. He was there four years. Colonel Bingham, I think—indeed, I feel quite sure—has been there longer on detail than any engineer officer who ever held this place. He says that he goes away at his own request. The gentleman from New York, to make his intimation good, insists that he lies. Well, the gentleman and Colonel Bingham will have to settle it.

Now, as to holding up vouchers. The expenditures for changes and improvements at the White House were made under the general direction of the President. He had the power to have the expenditures made and the accounts kept by the superintendent of public buildings and grounds or any other living person. He chose the superintendent of public buildings and grounds; he kept the accounts. I happen to know from conversations with the superintendent of public buildings and grounds that the President was very glad indeed to have him perform this duty, and that the superintendent of public buildings and grounds was pleased to perform it. So that "mare's nest" disappears.

Whether the contractor has complied with his contract or not I do not know. If he has not, he will not be paid; if he has, he ought to have his money.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman say whether, as a matter of fact, there is a conflict of opinion between Colonel Bingham and the Secretary of War as to the propriety of approving certain vouchers?

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment, no. The Secretary of War has nothing to do with their approval.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the Secretary of War has sought to have something to do with their approval and has been irritated because he has not been able to have something to do with their approval, that would lend some color to the language of the gentleman from New York, would it not?

Mr. CANNON. So far as I know or believe, the conflict exists in the gentleman's imagination or the imagination of somebody else. In a short session of Congress, to cut the whole matter short, I have enough to do to attend to the public business and matters that come before us regularly rather than spend my time in chasing down the suppositions of some beloved friend and brother who sends a dispatch that fills so much space in an honored newspaper. They have got to make the newspapers every day. I am not abusing them.

Now, one word as to the idea of my good friend—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois has stated that I have "intimated" that Colonel Bingham "lied." I hope he will withdraw that statement.

Mr. CANNON. I just wanted to say what the fact was—that to make his position good he must insist that Colonel Bingham had not been candid when he stated the reason why he was transferred. I will put it that way; that is more diplomatic. [Laughter.]

Now, I want to say just one word more, because I want to finish this bill to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there is no question before the committee. This discussion is proceeding by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANNON. I thought there was an amendment pending. Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield to me, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Heaven forbid! [Laughter.] Now, the gentleman from Tennessee objects to the language, "sixty thousand

dollars, to be expended by contract or otherwise, as the President may determine." But, after all, the language ought to be in that form. If it were provided that the contract should be given to the lowest bidder, it might happen that somebody that ought not to be admitted to the White House at all might come there in the guise of making repairs—somebody who might have evil designs. Therefore, for the expenditure of appropriations of this kind, looking to the comfort of the Chief Magistrate and for the benefit of all the people, language of this kind has always been adopted in all Administrations, and for a cause.

Now, to my friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] I want to say only a word. I do not think he and I can prevent people from entertaining at their own expense as they choose. The entertainments at the White House at the expense of the Government I do not think are subject to criticism. Some years ago a friend of mine from Chicago introduced to me an Englishman—a man of the middle class, a merchant—who called on me and presented the letter of introduction. It was during a short session of Congress. He said to me, "I have only one desire to gratify before I go away. I would like to see the President of this great Republic, if it is possible for me to do so. I can not stay here longer than ten days." "Well," said I, "is that all you want?" "Yes," said he, "I would go right away, well satisfied, if I could just be presented to the President." I said that I was in quite a hurry that morning. He came to my hotel. I sent for my daughter, who was there, and I said, after introducing the gentleman, "Helen, I must go to the Capitol. Will you be kind enough to accompany this gentleman to the White House and introduce him to the President?" She said, "Certainly, I will, papa," and that introduction was over in fifteen minutes! [Laughter.] He was a citizen of Great Britain, who had never had the pleasure of being introduced to the sovereign of his own country, but that is the way we do things in this country. [Applause.] And, gentlemen, we need not call on our imagination in respect to this matter. There is not a constituent of any man in the hearing of my voice who can not go to his Representative and be presented to the Chief Executive of the greatest, most powerful, freest, best Government on earth. I do not think we are in great danger of putting on frills; we are getting along first rate. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I will send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 96, line 4, strike out the word "sixty" and insert the word "forty-six."

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I desire the indulgence of the committee to state the facts upon which I base this amendment. Here is a letter of General Bingham, contained in a report of Mr. Root. I read a part of it a few moments ago. Here is what he says:

The following is a rough estimate of the expenses above referred to, and is below, rather than above, the actual needs:

1 assistant electrician, at \$50 per month	\$720
1 plumber, at \$1,000 per year	1,000
1 head fireman, at \$55 per month	780
2 assistant firemen, at \$55 per month each	1,320
2 extra house servants (laborers), at \$50 each per month	1,200
2 extra laborers in laundry, at \$25 per month each	600
Hauling and handling flowers and plants	2,000
For extra labor, hauling, sundries of all kinds, for the large functions in winter and for increased entertainments in the White House throughout the year	5,000
For purchase of extra flowers beyond what can be supplied by the gardens	1,500
Total	14,120

General Bingham further says: "The above amounts to about \$15,000, which, added to the \$35,000 found necessary during the past year, makes a total of \$50,000, and the appropriation should be \$60,000, to cover all contingency," that unused being covered back into the Treasury.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is needless for me to say that this report does not in effect arraign the management of the White House with a long line of extravagance. It does say that the President is doing a large amount of entertaining, that we have destroyed the flower house adjoining the White House, where we used to go and listen to the dulcet strains of far-off music, looking at the unplucked buds! [Laughter.]

Flowers must now be hauled a mile from the propagating garden, and others bought out in the city, when entertainments are given. Some of the work done—the improvements, so called—is bungling and painfully unattractive, very costly, and reflects credit on no one. After the President's office—this new little headquarters—had been about finished on the west, and the tunnel on the east side was about complete, some one came along and said, "Where is your coal house?" The reply was, "I forgot



that;" and then the coal house was put between the White House and this new office of the President.

So the coal house is now between the White House and where the President has his office. Just think of such an architect as that! I can go down into my district and pick up some carpenter down there, whether he votes the Republican or the Democratic ticket, and particularly if he votes the Democratic ticket, who can plan and erect a better addition to the White House than this and at less cost, I dare say.

Now, I subtract the \$14,120 from the \$60,000 and offer my amendment accordingly. The President's salary has been increased to \$50,000 since the days of President Grant, whose predecessors were paid \$25,000 annually—Lincoln, Jackson, and all. Yet here, on the anniversary of the birthday of Lincoln, we are asked to countenance this extravagance. I have never heard that Lincoln was ever accused of extravagance. The architect wrought cruel changes that now force General Bingham to ask for extra appropriations to cover, a most notable change being the substitution of a coal cellar for the beautiful and useful conservatory. These extras are asked for "because the President is doing a large amount of entertaining," says General Bingham. This is one of the causes.

Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect to the distinguished occupant of the White House, I say that we ought at least to go back and conduct the White House along the frugal lines upon which the lamented McKinley, if you please, conducted it when he was President and Mr. Roosevelt was Vice-President, when Cleveland was there, and their long line of predecessors.

Where is this going to stop, this coming in here and calling upon the people of the country to pay their tax money in extra amounts, for what? For having things that are extravagant, things that are unnecessary, things unheard of for more than a century of this glorious Republic. Shall we sit here with such a document as this General Bingham's letter before us (which, by the way, I did not see until a few moments ago, when I sent to the document room and got it), and agree to any such extravagance as this? I for one can not possibly agree to this bold-faced expenditure for an extravagance, practically denominated as such, certainly proved to be such, by General Bingham.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word. This estimate of \$60,000 is the amount that was made and regularly transmitted. We sent for the gentleman and examined him. This examination is here. That is the amount that is required, and that is all the answer I desire to make to the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the distinguished chairman of the committee, in commenting upon the question whether improvements to the White House should be let out by contract or otherwise, referred to the fact that possibly if it was let out by contract dangerous characters might be admitted into the White House in the vicinity of the President. I want to ask the gentleman if he thinks anything could be more dangerous from the standpoint of a designing anarchist who is seeking an opportunity to take the life of the President than to put him down there in that little underground affair, which reminds one of a Western dugout—almost a chicken coop—called the Executive offices, just south of the Cabinet room, where the President himself sits, exposed by open windows? It would not take an expert anarchist very long to shoot the President through one of those windows.

Mr. Chairman, we spent much time last winter in passing a law to protect the President from the assaults of anarchists, and we now have built a place in which to put him that invites their attention. I say it is most remarkable, when we are trying to protect the President, that we should place him in so exposed a position and give those seeking his life so good an opportunity to get in their work. Now, does the gentleman think a contractor could be more dangerous to the life of the President than forcing him to stay all the time where he does when attending to the business of the country?

Mr. CANNON. This appropriation has always run this way for a wise reason. I have stated one of the reasons. I do not care to multiply words, and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does the gentleman know what percentage the architect got on these improvements?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I do not know. I have no knowledge. I think 5 per cent is the usual amount.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I understood it was 10 per cent. The gentleman has no definite information.

Mr. CANNON. I have no knowledge about it, and, great heavens, I have no patience with the architect!

I ask for a vote.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, in order that everyone who desires may know exactly what I have been quot-

ing from here, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the report containing the letter of General Bingham.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the report from which he read a moment ago. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

[House Doc. No. 321, Fifty-seventh Congress, second session.]

#### BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IN AND AROUND WASHINGTON, D. C.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting revised estimates of appropriation for buildings and grounds in and around Washington, January 23, 1903.—Referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

Washington, January 23, 1903.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith, for the consideration of Congress, copy of a communication from the Secretary of War of the 23d instant, submitting revised estimates of appropriations under "Buildings and grounds in and around Washington in charge of the Chief of Engineers," aggregating \$110,264, in lieu of estimates for like objects on pages 254 and 255 of the Book of Estimates for 1904, aggregating \$59,764.

Respectfully,

L. M. SHAW,  
Secretary.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

#### WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, January 23, 1903.

SIR: I have the honor to forward herewith, for transmission to Congress, increased estimates of appropriations pertaining to buildings and grounds in and around Washington in charge of the Chief of Engineers, to replace like estimates submitted in the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, as follows:

Improvement and care of public grounds.....	\$9,400
Repairs, fuel, etc., Executive Mansion.....	80,000
Lighting, etc., Executive Mansion, etc.....	20,864

Total.....110,264

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,  
Secretary of War.

The SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

#### OFFICE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,

Washington, January 21, 1903.

GENERAL: 1. At the request of Hon. JOSEPH G. CANNON, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, made this day, I have the honor to forward herewith certain increased estimates pertaining to the White House and the grounds of same for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, to take the place of corresponding estimates submitted with annual report dated July 19, 1902, with the following remarks explanatory of the necessity for the increased estimates. Mr. Cannon has signified a desire that these revised estimates be sent at once through the regular channels, so that they may reach him not later than Thursday, January 22, 1903.

2. As a preliminary, it is proper to call attention to the fact that the annual report of this office (including estimates for the second following fiscal year) is required to be submitted not later than July 20. The estimates so submitted are not considered by Congress until about six months later (and generally more); and in six months circumstances change very materially, making it absolutely necessary in this case for the public service to ask for the increased estimates herewith submitted for the White House.

3. In June last, at the close of the last session of Congress, provision was made for the expenditure of large sums of money for remodeling the White House and for building a new building for the offices of the President. Within three weeks of that time estimates were submitted by this office for the ensuing year.

It was impossible at that time to do more than to submit the usual estimates, based on the experience of past years. Now, seven months later, circumstances have changed very materially. The White House has been changed so materially that an entirely new estimate is needed, with no past experience as a guide, and with the separate building for the offices of the President to be also provided for.

4. The recent changes of the White House have resulted in a building far more expensive to keep up than formerly. The architects have not yet fully completed their work, and it will certainly be the end of February before all workmen are completely out of the house. It will be impossible to give accurate estimates of the cost of running the new house until the workmen are out of the way and a whole year elapsed thereafter, because it takes a whole year for the house to be put through its various uses.

5. The last appropriation for "Care, repair, and refurnishing of the Executive Mansion" was \$25,000. It has since been found necessary to ask for \$10,000 in addition thereto for the current year on the general deficiency bill, which makes a total of \$35,000, and changes may yet have to be made in the tank and filter.

The character of the new fittings and furnishings of the White House is such that repairs and replacing of ordinary wear and tear, of accidents, will be much more expensive than before. For instance, it will be much more expensive to replace the specially designed silver door knobs and escutcheons, the various glass knobs, the silver and gilt hinges, curtain fixtures, window fixtures, etc.

6. The hard-wood floors and tiling all over the house will require much extra labor to keep in order.

The plumbing system, which is much more extensive than before, will require the entire services of a plumber, who must also look after the new office building, which contains much plumbing.

The electrician who has charge of the electric machinery, motors, pumps, fans, and over 2,300 incandescent lights, all the bell and telephone wiring, etc., must have an assistant because he has also to care for the new office building.

During a part of the year there must be three men—one on duty all of the time to look after the fires, as the heating is more intricate than before, involving one boiler for hot water and another for steam, and various other fires in the office building, in the laundry, etc.

More help will be needed in the laundry, owing to the large family which occupies the White House and the large amount of entertaining done by the President, which increases the use of table linen, etc.

7. As the conservatory of the old house has been abolished, a considerable amount of expense for labor and hauling is necessary to decorate the house, which now has to be done from the propagating gardens, a mile away.

The former estimate for labor and incidentals connected with the winter entertainments at the White House must have a considerable increase, because the President is doing a large amount of entertaining. Also owing to the abolition of the conservatories and greenhouses, flowers have, from time to time, to be purchased for the winter entertainments beyond what can now be furnished by the propagating gardens.

8. The following is a rough estimate of the expenses above referred to, and is below rather than above the actual needs:

1 assistant electrician, at \$60 per month.....	\$720
1 plumber, at \$1,000 per year.....	1,000
1 head fireman, at \$65 per month.....	780
2 assistant firemen, at \$55 per month each.....	1,320
2 extra house servants (laborers), at \$50 each per month.....	1,200
2 extra laborers in laundry, at \$25 per month each.....	600
Hauling and handling flowers and plants.....	2,000
For extra labor, hauling, sundries of all kinds, for the large functions in winter and for increased entertainments in the White House throughout the year.....	5,000
For purchase of extra flowers beyond what can be supplied by the gardens.....	1,500
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>14,120</b>

9. It is impossible to make this estimate complete, but, as will be seen, the above amounts to about \$15,000, which, added to the \$35,000 found necessary during the past year, makes a total of \$50,000, and the appropriation should be \$90,000 to cover all contingencies. It is of course understood that any amounts not found necessary are returned to the Treasury.

10. Under the heading "Maintenance of White House grounds within the iron fence," the former appropriation was \$1,000. This was at a time when the services of the entire force of gardeners and laborers used in the White House conservatories were available. As the conservatories have been abolished and the force above referred to is no longer available for this use, it is necessary to increase this estimate to \$4,000.

11. Under the heading "Lighting the Executive Mansion and public grounds:"

(a) The number of lights in the house has been increased two and a half times, now numbering over 2,200.

(b) The new electric motor takes two and a half times the current formerly used, and there is an electric dish warmer in the pantry, which consumes considerable current.

(c) Under the new plumbing system it is necessary to run an electric pump almost all day.

(d) In addition to all the above, which is in the White House itself, there is the lighting of the new Executive office building, of which I have not now the exact figures, but which very materially increases the amount of current used.

The former appropriation for this purpose was \$12,500, instead of which \$20,000 will now be required.

12. The item for fuel, which has heretofore been \$3,000, will now require \$8,000, because of the increased number of fires and the increased quantity of fuel required to heat the new Executive office, which is a separate building.

13. Out of the material of the former conservatories, which were torn down, I have constructed at the propagating gardens as much greenhouse as was possible. These houses are not yet completed, and it will take a year before the plants in them can be overhauled and reorganized and made available for use at the Executive Mansion.

Hence the item for "Repairs to conservatory and greenhouses" is still necessary, and the sum asked for, namely, \$3,000, will be sufficient, except that it is necessary to insert the word "reerection," so that this amount will be available for the utilization of the material brought away from the now destroyed conservatories.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

THEO. A. BINGHAM,

Colonel, United States Army, Major, Corps of Engineers.

Brig. Gen. G. L. GILLESPIE,

Chief of Engineers, United States Army, Washington, D. C.

Estimates of appropriations required for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, by the Chief of Engineers.

Detailed objects of expenditure, and explanations.	Estimated amount which will be required for each detailed object of expenditure.	Total amount to be appropriated under each head of appropriation.	Amount appropriated for the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1903.
<b>BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS IN AND AROUND WASHINGTON IN CHARGE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS.</b>			
<i>Improvement and care of public grounds—</i>			
For improvement, care, and maintenance of grounds of Executive Departments. (Act June 28, 1902, vol. 32, p. 460, sec. 1.).....	\$1,000		
For improvement and maintenance of Executive Mansion grounds within iron fence (increase of \$3,000 submitted). (Same act.).....	4,000		
For the employment of an engineer by the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds.....	2,400		
For purchase and repair of machinery and tools for shops at the nursery. (Same act.).....	2,000	\$9,400	\$6,400
<i>Repairs, fuel, etc., Executive Mansion—</i>			
For care, repair, and refurnishing of the Executive Mansion, to be expended by contract or otherwise as the President may determine (increase of \$35,000 submitted). (Act of June 28, 1902, vol. 32, pp. 460-461, sec. 1.).....	60,000		
For fuel for the Executive Mansion, President's office building, greenhouses, and stable (increase of \$5,000 submitted). (Same act.).....	8,000		

Estimates of appropriations required for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, by the Chief of Engineers—Continued.

Detailed objects of expenditure, and explanations.	Estimated amount which will be required for each detailed object of expenditure.	Total amount to be appropriated under each head of appropriation.	Amount appropriated for the current fiscal year, ending June 30, 1903.
<b>BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS, ETC.—continued.</b>			
<i>Repairs, fuel, etc., Executive Mansion—Continued.</i>			
For care and maintenance of conservatory and greenhouses (increase of \$2,000 submitted). (Same act.).....	\$9,000		
For reerection of and repairs to conservatory and greenhouses. (Same act.).....	3,000	\$80,000	\$38,000
<i>Lighting, etc., Executive Mansion, etc.—</i>			
For gas, pay of lamplighters, gas fitters, and laborers; purchase, erection, and repair of lamps and lamp-posts; purchase of matches and repairs of all kinds; stoves, fuel, and lights for office and office stable, for watchmen's lodges, and for greenhouses at the nursery (increase of \$7,500 submitted). (Act June 28, 1902, vol. 32, p. 461, sec. 1.).....	20,000		
<i>Provided,</i> That for each 5-foot burner not connected with a meter in the lamps on the public grounds not more than \$30 shall be paid per lamp for gas, including lighting, cleaning, and keeping the lamps in repair, under any expenditure provided for in this act; and said lamps shall burn every night on the average from forty-five minutes after sunset to forty-five minutes before sunrise; and authority is hereby given to substitute other illuminating material for the same or less price, and to use so much of the sum hereby appropriated as may be necessary for that purpose.			
For lighting six arc electric lights in Executive Mansion grounds within the iron fence, 366 nights, at not exceeding \$72 per light per annum (same act.).....	432		
For lighting six arc electric lights at the propagating gardens, 366 nights, at not exceeding \$72 per light per annum (same act.).....	432	20,864	13,364
		110,264	57,764

NOTE.—The necessity for the increase in certain of the foregoing items over those for the present year, and for the change in the wording of certain items, is explained in the accompanying letter, dated January 21, 1903, of Col. Theo. A. Bingham, U. S. Army, in charge of Public Buildings and Grounds.—(G. L. Gillespie, Brig. Gen., Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army.)

OFFICE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, U. S. ARMY,

January 22, 1903.

Respectfully submitted to the Secretary of War.

G. L. GILLESPIE,

Brig. Gen., Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improving Mouth of Columbia River, Oregon and Washington: For continuing improvement in accordance with the approved or modified project, as authorized, \$1,000,000.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 13, page 108, after the word "dollars," the following: "To continue the work of repairing and renewing the revetments on the Kansas bank of the Missouri River, in Elwood and Belmont bends, near the city of St. Joseph, Mo., the sum of \$40,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall be compelled to make the point of order on that. The conclusive reason against it is that in this bill there is no jurisdiction over that subject. There is another reason, that this is not authorized by law.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors will insist upon his point of order, because it is for the continuation of a public work, and no one knows better than the gentleman from Ohio that work has been done on the Missouri River at this very point. He knows, no doubt, as does the Chair, that it has been frequently held that where work has been suspended for a short time an amendment to resume the work was not subject to a point of order.

Each year since 1884 work has been done on the Missouri River at the point covered by this amendment. In the last appropriation bill \$175,000 was appropriated to continue improvements on the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the



river. It will be admitted by the gentleman that even as late as December last work was done on the Missouri River at this very point. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to a ruling made during the second session of the Fifty-fourth Congress (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1261). It was held that the repair of a bridge built at Government expense is the continuation of a public work.

In the Forty-eighth Congress, second session, it was held that the completion of a naval vessel, although the work has been long interrupted, is the continuation of a public work. (See RECORD, Forty-eighth Congress, second session, pp. 1913, 1914.) That being true, surely this point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas inform the Chair as to whether there was any limit of cost fixed when the work was originally authorized?

Mr. CURTIS. None whatever. I will state further, and I hope it will be considered by the committee when the vote is taken on this amendment, that the Missouri River Commission recommend in their report that the work at this point be continued. They say:

These revetments have received a large amount of repair work and renewals, and at the present time stand in need of a considerable amount of repair.

If this river should cut through at this point, it would be attended with disastrous results to the interests of St. Joe and have a far-reaching and detrimental effect on navigation. If the work is not continued at this point, there is great danger of the river breaking through the revetments and doing great damage to property and detrimental to navigation.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I was temporarily out of the House and did not hear this amendment. Is this an amendment offered to the bill for the purpose of improving some part of the Missouri River?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir. Will the Clerk report the amendment again?

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. CURTIS. It is to continue the work of repairing the revetments of the Missouri River in Ellwood and Belmont bends of the Missouri River, near the city of St. Joe.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Does not the gentleman think it is a pretty dangerous practice to say that we should have no appropriation for that river, and then that we should give appropriations to certain favored spots and leave the balance of the river to suffer?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think this is a favored spot; if it was, the gentleman from Ohio would not have made the point of order against the amendment. I want to say, further, I do not believe in the practice of opposing amendments of this kind. Amendments which provide for the protection of property and assist navigation should be agreed to.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. The point I make is, why select out certain favored spots for certain favored people and neglect the balance of the 2,000 miles of the river? I think that is not consistent.

Mr. CURTIS. I was not one of the favored. In fact, there are no favored people.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It should be brought here with the balance of the river. A few people selected may get favors, and there ought not to be such a preference.

Mr. CURTIS. I would suggest that the gentleman prepare and offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Kansas if this work is under contract?

Mr. CURTIS. No, sir. It was until last year in charge of the Missouri River Commission. This Commission was abolished in the last river and harbor bill. Now the work is under the charge of the War Department. There is a commissioner, Mr. Chittenden, located, I believe, at Sioux City, Iowa, who has charge of the work on the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. From Sioux City to the mouth?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. REEVES. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. REEVES. Is there any existing project now under contract that you now seek to have the amendment offered for—

Mr. CURTIS. There was \$175,000 appropriated to continue the improvements on the Missouri River between Sioux City and its mouth, and work was done at the point covered by this amendment as late as December, 1902.

Mr. REEVES. The gentleman did not permit me to conclude my question. But I want to suggest to the gentleman, since he has answered me, that there is no project that this amendment would be applicable to, and where there is no project upon which the appropriation has been made the point of order must necessarily be good.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Chairman, a question of such importance

is involved here that unless the mind of the Chair is made up I should like to be heard briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON. The appropriations in this sundry civil bill are made in pursuance of authorizations contained in preceding river and harbor bills. The very phraseology here at the beginning makes this clear:

Toward the construction of works on harbors and rivers, under contract and otherwise, and within the limits authorized by law, namely.

Then it goes on: For works authorized by the river and harbor act of 1896; then by the river and harbor act of 1899; then by the river and harbor act of 1902. The phraseology of these authorizations is practically the same in all. I will read one in our last bill:

Improving harbor at Gloucester, Mass.: For continuing improvement, \$75,000. *Provided*, That a contract or contracts may be entered into by the Secretary of War for such materials and work as may be necessary in accordance with the approved project, to be paid for as the appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$227,083.

The \$75,000 is an appropriation; the \$227,083 is an authorization. Every one of the items in this bill is one for which an authorization was made and a limit fixed in some previous river and harbor bill. This is by no means a new question. In the Congress which was in session on the 5th of May, 1900, an amendment was proposed as to this river by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD]. The amendment was in these words:

Insert the following:

"Improving the Missouri River at Jefferson, Mo., continuing improvement, \$50,000; at Overton, Mo., continuing improvement, \$50,000."

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON] raised the point of order that on the sundry civil bill such an amendment could not be placed, and that point of order was sustained. The limit of this character of appropriation was also very clearly stated so far back as the Fifty-second Congress. It appears in the RECORD for the second session, page 1065.

This was a case where the point of order was raised to all of the class of appropriations contained in this bill. It was claimed that no river and harbor appropriation should go on the sundry civil bill, but the Chair ruled that if the provision authorized a specific amount previously authorized in a river and harbor bill, you could put it on the sundry civil bill.

The Chair would say if the Appropriations Committee should bring in a bill having an item or paragraph declaring in the usual language of the river and harbor bills that so much money should be appropriated for improving a river or harbor, without a law previously made authorizing and requiring the appropriation, the Committee on Appropriations would not have jurisdiction to bring in such a measure. In other words, it would not have jurisdiction unless the appropriation of money for that river or that harbor had been previously authorized by law and required to be met as an obligation of the Government.

Now, not only is this the case, but this amendment is contrary to the law. We had some discussion about the Missouri River when the last river and harbor bill was passed. We abolished the Missouri River commission. Instead of making appropriations for specific points on the river the bill contained a provision for appropriating \$175,000 in one sum with this direction. I will read the provision, or so much of it as is necessary.

Improving the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river, continuing improvement, \$175,000. Said sum to be expended in such manner and in such localities as the Secretary of War may direct.

Then it goes on to speak of the different localities at which surveys are to be made. Under this provision the Secretary of War can appropriate any part, even all of it, for this locality if it is worthy, but the law was changed and the change provided a very different method. First, there was the abolition of the commission and, second, the abandonment of specific appropriation for this place or any other place. I can hardly exaggerate the injustice that would be done by enacting this provision. It is in the same class with thirty or forty which have been brought to the attention of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, all of which we have felt compelled to reject at this session, because we could not bring in one and do justice without bringing in thirty or forty others. So this is not in accordance with good policy and is clearly contrary to the provisions in the law.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to call the attention of the Chairman to the wording of the item of this bill on page 107:

For continuing improvement for the mouth of the Mississippi River to St. Paul, Minn., \$400,000.

The item in the last bill read as follows:

For improving the Missouri River from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth of the river, continuing improvement.

Now, the gentleman forgets to call attention of the Chair to the fact that in this very item the Secretary of War is required to cause examinations to be had at St. Joe with a view to ascertain what improvements, if any, are necessary for navigation. This would indicate that appropriations of this very kind would be asked for.

Mr. BURTON. The gentleman does not want the House to

misunderstand him. There is a radical difference between his amendment and this appropriation of \$400,000, to which he refers; that is one-third of \$1,200,000 authorized in the preceding bill.

Mr. CURTIS. But it does not say so.

Mr. BURTON. It is not necessary to say so. It is expected the House can look back at the preceding bill.

Mr. CURTIS. The House may look back to the preceding bills for each session since 1884 and will find that appropriations have been made in almost this same language, except providing for a commission, to make improvements on the Missouri River from Sioux City to its mouth.

Mr. BURTON. I think the gentleman entirely misunderstands the law in regard to this matter. The appropriation of which he speaks was one in which \$400,000 cash was appropriated; and there was an authorization of \$1,200,000 besides the \$400,000. This \$400,000 is in pursuance of that authorization. Your appropriation of \$175,000 is final; it is appropriated in cash; it is not coupled with any authorization.

Mr. CURTIS. If that argument is sound, then every time we make an appropriation that appropriation is final. The gentleman from Ohio knows that it has been repeatedly held by the Chair that if an item is contained in an appropriation bill from session to session and then is left out by the committee, an amendment to restore the item is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. BURTON. That may be; but still it should be reported in a proper manner.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of so much importance that if the Chair is not ready to rule, I should like to be heard in favor of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Upon the facts conceded in the discussion on this point of order it is clear to the Chair that if the item proposed in this amendment had been originally included in the pending appropriation bill as it came from the Committee on Appropriations it would not have been in order, on the ground that the Committee on Appropriations under the rules of the House has no jurisdiction of the subject-matter of this amendment. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; to which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 6525. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 12098. An act to amend section 1 of the act of Congress approved May 14, 1898, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for a right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska;" and

H. R. 13307. An act for the relief of Valdemar Poulsen.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 14764. An act to establish United States courts at Wilkesboro, N. C.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 16161) granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Tradewell, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. TALIAFERRO as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the House to the bill (S. 569) to establish the department of commerce and labor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

#### Senate concurrent resolution 65.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 569) to establish the department of commerce and labor the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to insert, in line 12 of the third paragraph of section 6, after the word "Interstate," the word "Commerce."

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Philippine Islands: For the relief of the distress in the Philippine Islands, to be expended under the direction and in the discretion of the Philippine government in such proportions as they deem wise, in the direct purchase and distribution or sale of farm implements, farm animals, supplies, and necessities of life, and through the employment of labor in the construction of government wagon roads, railroads, and other public works, to be immediately available, \$3,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. LOUD. I desire to reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. JONES of Kentucky. I wish to make a point of order against this section.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I shall insist upon the point of order, but I made it, or, rather, reserved it, in order that we might hear some explanation of this matter.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think that the paragraph is subject to a point of order. Of course we can not proceed to perfect the paragraph by amendment or to discuss its merits while the point of order is pending.

Mr. LOUD. I desired to reserve the point of order so that the gentleman might have an opportunity to explain the paragraph. Of course he will not assume for a moment that the paragraph is not subject to a point of order. I do not think he can contest that question.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I certainly shall not contest it unless the point of order is made.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I ask whether the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] has made a point of order against this item?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I think he now withdraws the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Well, I renew the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Virginia on the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The point is this: That there is no law authorizing this expenditure. This is new legislation, pure and simple—absolutely so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I suppose that before the point of order is decided we might agree upon a reasonable time for discussion of the item, with opportunity to amend it. If there be opportunity for discussion and amendment, no one, I think, is disposed to insist on the point of order. All that is desired is reasonable time for discussion and amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I have an amendment which I propose to submit, and I have no objection to a reasonable time for discussion.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. What would the gentleman regard as "reasonable time?"

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I suggest that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois be read for information, pending the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposed amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 111, line 24, strike out "railroads," and on page 112, in line 2, insert, after the word "dollars," the words: "And the governor of the Philippines shall submit to the Secretary of War a statement of all expenditures hereunder."

Mr. CANNON. That is the amendment I propose to offer. If any gentleman wishes to insist on the point of order, and if the amendment is subject to the point of order, that will dispose of the question. If, however, the point of order be withdrawn, I shall be quite willing for any reasonable discussion upon the proposition. I apprehend that we need have no difficulty in agreeing about that.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have an amendment which I propose to offer and which is almost identical in language with that of the gentleman just read. I will read what I propose to offer, so that the gentleman may see what the difference is.

I propose that on page 111, line 24, the word "railroads," and on page 112, line 1, the words "and other public works" be stricken out, and propose further to add the following language to the section instead of that offered by the gentleman from Illinois:

And provided, That said Philippine Government through the governor of the Philippines shall submit annually to Congress, and oftener if so required by the President of the United States, an itemized statement or report showing in detail the manner in which the expenditures herein contemplated have been made.

That covers exactly the provision of the gentleman from Illinois, but it is somewhat fuller, and I think we ought to have a detailed report.

Mr. CANNON. I have no objection to a complete report of the expenditure of this money.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Then I will say frankly to the gentleman that I propose another amendment, inasmuch as it is not proposed now by the committee that the Government shall enter upon the building of railroads, that this appropriation should be reduced from three millions to one million, or at least a million and a half.

Mr. CANNON. Well, of course it would be subject to all amendments which are germane, but my friend will see at once that if the point of order is well taken, that disposes of the whole



question. Now, if the gentleman does not desire to press his point of order, I am quite ready to negotiate with him as to any reasonable discussion, and of course the section will be subject to all amendments which are germane.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Would not the gentleman be willing also to negotiate as to the amendment he is going to propose, the amendment which is in line with the amendment that I propose to offer?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, any amendments that are germane could be offered. I have no pride in mine.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Let the gentleman reserve his point of order.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. That is not the question. The question is whether or not we might not agree on this amendment. Does not the gentleman think that the amount ought to be reduced?

Mr. CANNON. No, I do not, from the best information that we can get. I do not know that the whole amount will be expended, but I suspect that it would be. I think it ought not to be reduced, considering the condition of the Philippines. As to the matter of accounting and striking out the word "railroads," I do not know that it is anticipated to build any railroads. Possibly there may be something in and about the Army posts or elsewhere. I have no objection to striking it out, but I think the wagon roads and other public improvements ought to remain, because I believe it is desirable from every standpoint that the people who are to receive this relief should invariably earn it where it is possible. That was the course followed in Porto Rico.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I would say to the gentleman frankly that I myself would not insist upon this point of order provided the gentleman is willing to strike out the words "and other public works."

Mr. CANNON. I think those words ought to stay there. There may be harbor improvements—anything, I would say to my friend, which would tend toward public improvement where the recipient of this charity would earn it rather than receive it for nothing is desirable. It is much better for the recipient and it is better for the government of the Philippines.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I understand that, but my idea is that the government of the Philippines should furnish that money. This is a purely charitable appropriation, absolutely so.

Mr. CANNON. Considering the situation and under all the conditions and revenues of the Philippines, they are not prepared to relieve themselves.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I would like to ask the gentleman how much time he would be willing to allow for the discussion.

Mr. CANNON. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Gentlemen on our side think there ought at least to be an hour and a half set aside for the discussion of this item.

Mr. CANNON. That would be three-quarters of an hour to a side.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I am perfectly willing to agree to that.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman, then, that I will not insist on the point of order. Of course I can not speak for all gentlemen on our side, for I have not conferred with them.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman then withdraws his point of order, and I will offer the amendment and that will take it beyond the point of order.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. With the understanding that the gentleman will ask that an hour and a half be allowed for discussion.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; one-half hour on this side and one-half on the gentleman's side. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that an hour and a half be set aside for debate on this proposition, one-half thereof to be under the control, I will say, of myself, and one-half under the control of the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that an hour and a half be set aside for general debate on the pending proposition, one-half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Virginia.

During the submission of the foregoing request by the Chairman the following occurred:

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Will that take it beyond the point of order, a reserved point of order?

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Then I will raise the point of order.

Mr. ROBB. It is too late.

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. But, Mr. Chairman, I raised the point of order on this matter in time, before the Chairman put the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Well; I said it loud enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Before submitting the request of the gentleman from Illinois, when the gentleman from Virginia withdrew his point of order—

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. And I raised the point of order in time, immediately after the gentleman withdrew it. I submit I have some rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman to make any point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. The Chair can give me those rights now, whether he understood it or not. The Chair is here to rule according to the parliamentary procedure of this body, and when I make this point of order—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will take his seat until the Chair makes his statement. The Chair understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to ask the gentleman from Illinois if that would cut off the right to reserve the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I can not understand the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. And thereupon the gentleman from Illinois answered that it would, and nothing more was said. The Chair submitted to the committee the request of the gentleman from Illinois, and there was no objection, and it was so ordered; and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania raised the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. That is an exact statement of the facts.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I have no doubt that the Chair did not hear the point of order that I raised, but nevertheless my statement is entitled to verity when it is not denied by anybody here, whether the Chair heard it or not, that I raised the point of order in time, and I am certainly not contending for any more than the rights which every member has on this floor, to have accorded to him what the rules give him. When I make that statement I certainly should not be cut off in this manner.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, I heard the gentleman. He did not persist. The Chair, I apprehend, did not hear him and the action was had. Now, I ask unanimous consent that the order may be vacated, so that the gentleman, if he desires to make the point of order on this provision, shall have the opportunity to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the order just made be vacated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order, and I would say that I know so little about the reasons which have actuated this committee to put this matter into this bill that I ask that this debate proceed under a reserved point of order.

Mr. CANNON. I will not consent to that.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I think I am entitled to know why this is put in here. If it is right I want to agree to it.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely.

Mr. BROMWELL. If it is not right, then vote it down.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I lose my right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has every right, if he can get a majority of the committee with him, to exclude this, to amend it, to reject it, or do anything else; but I am not going on here for an hour and a half discussing the merits of this proposition, and then have the gentleman make his point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has already proposed an amendment to his own bill. There is no testimony in the hearings here that I have been able to find after diligent search for a couple of days.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is not in order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. We would like to know some reason for it.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I should like to interrogate the gentleman in charge of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. I desire to say that if the gentleman will change his amendment so as to strike out after the words "necessities of life," I do not think this will be so objectionable; but there are, I believe, two honest and cogent reasons why that should not be put in this appropriation bill.

Mr. STEELE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may be right about that. If so, the House would vote with him. I do not think he is right. Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. The chairman of the committee knows that the House does not vote right according to my views of right, but according to his views of right.

Mr. CANNON. After all, the committee is bigger than both of us.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. But I do not claim to have the same power over the committee as the gentleman from Illinois. I think that should be added to the gentleman's amendment. Otherwise, I shall insist on my point of order.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman can exercise his rights. I will not quarrel with him about it.

Mr. HEPBURN. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I now ask, in fairness to the gentleman from Virginia, if he still desires general debate—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Of course we still desire it.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that there may be an hour and a half of general debate, to be divided equally, the gentleman from Virginia to control one-half and myself one-half.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman that some of my friends who are on the Insular Committee are urging me to ask that the gentleman make it two hours.

Mr. CANNON. I would rather not. We will have the five-minute discussion after that.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I will not insist. I would be glad if the gentleman—

Mr. CANNON. I hope to finish the bill to-night. I am going to ask the committee to sit until we finish it. It will be 5 o'clock at the end of the hour and a half.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that one and a half hours be devoted to debate on this paragraph, one half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES]. Is there objection?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I reserve the right to object. I want a little consultation over the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee objects.

Mr. CANNON. Then I ask for the reading of the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On line 24, page 111, strike out the word "railroads;" and, on page 112, in line 2, after the word "dollars," insert:

"And the governor of the Philippines shall submit to the Secretary of War a statement of all expenditures hereunder."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Will the gentleman permit me to call his attention to one fact?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. This amendment directs that this money shall be expended under the direction of the Philippine governor.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The Secretary of War is not mentioned anywhere in this at all. Now, I fail to see how the Secretary of War can make a report unless the Philippine government renders an account of its expenditures under this appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. Then I ask for the reading of the text as it would be if amended.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the text as it will be if the amendment is adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 24 of page 111 strike out "railroads;" and on page 112, in line 2, after the word "dollars," insert "and the governor of the Philippines shall submit to the Secretary of War a statement of all expenditures hereunder;" so as to read:

"And necessities of life, and through the employment in the construction of Government wagon roads and other public works, to be immediately available, \$3,000,000, and the governor of the Philippines shall submit to the Secretary of War a statement of all expenditures hereunder."

Mr. CANNON. Now, I think that meets my friend's criticism. I want to call the attention of the committee very briefly to what has moved the Committee on Appropriations, I believe almost unanimously, I think perhaps quite so, to report this appropriation. Governor Taft makes a report as to the condition of the Philippines which is abstracted in substance—and I have read both—in a communication from the Secretary of War, and I will ask the Clerk to read, commencing with the word "President," on page 11, and ending at page 12.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 6, 1903.

The PRESIDENT:

I have the honor to transmit herewith the third annual report of the Philippine Commission, covering the year ending October 1, 1902. This report is in compliance with the third paragraph of the instructions to the Philippine Commission, dated April 7, 1900, and with section 86 of the act entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902.

Accompanying the report, and transmitted with it, are the acts of the

Philippine Commission, from and including act No. 425, enacted July 2, 1902, to and including act No. 493, enacted October 27, 1902.

Section 86 of the act of Congress above cited requires that these laws shall be reported to Congress. All of the laws enacted by the Commission prior to that act have already been reported to Congress.

I beg to ask special consideration of the recommendations of the Commission, all of which have my hearty approval.

It seems to me that the conditions resulting from the destruction by rinderpest of 90 per cent of the carabaos, the draft animals of the islands, and the consequent failure of the rice crop, followed by an epidemic of cholera, are so serious and distressing as to call for action by Congress beyond that for which the Commission specifically ask.

The removal under the laws of Congress of export duties on goods shipped from the Philippines to the United States has materially reduced the revenues of the island, while the duties collected in the United States upon importations from the Philippines, which under the same laws were to be turned over to the Philippine treasury, and were expected to make good the deficit, have amounted to practically nothing. At the same time the decline in the price of silver, the evils of a fluctuating currency, and the impoverishment of the people, have reduced the government revenues when they are most needed for relief of the people.

I think the occasion for relief in the Philippines is now greater than it was in Cuba when Congress appropriated \$3,000,000 for the payment of the Cuban soldiers out of the Treasury of the United States, or than it was in Porto Rico when hundreds of thousands of dollars were contributed by the people of the United States, and more than a million of dollars paid out of the National Treasury for the relief of the sufferers from the hurricane of August, 1899.

An appropriation of not less than \$3,000,000 for the relief of the distress in the Philippine Islands from the causes which I have mentioned would be in harmony with the course pursued by Congress toward the people of the other Spanish islands and practical evidence of the sincere interest that the people of the United States take in the welfare of the Philippine people and of the kindly and generous treatment which they are to receive. Previous experience indicates that such an appropriation could be made the most useful by giving the Philippine government discretion to apply it, in such proportions as they deem wise, in the direct purchase and distribution or sale of supplies, or through the employment of labor in the construction of Government wagon roads, railroads, or other public works.

Very respectfully,

ELIHU ROOT,  
Secretary of War.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I yet?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will ask unanimous consent for five minutes more. I think I can say all I want to in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. This recommendation tells the story. It is an abstract of a report made by Governor Taft. Gentlemen understand about the currency trouble that they have had in the Philippines. They understand, further, that they have had almost a continuous state of war and brigandage for a number of years. It also appears from this report that the rinderpest had attacked the cattle or carabaos, the draft animals used in the Philippines, being the only draft animals they have, and that 90 per cent of them have been destroyed.

It appears, further, that they have had an epidemic of cholera throughout the archipelago, and that in round numbers 100,000 lives have been lost from this epidemic. From the Philippine revenues rice in limited quantity, large quantities, has been purchased and distributed to those who were suffering. As the time approaches to make the new crop they are without draft animals, they have largely advanced in price, and have to be brought from other countries, and there is a condition of suffering there that justifies the appropriation of this \$3,000,000. That is all I want to say about that.

I want to say further that the Secretary of War recommends that, considering the experience we had in Cuba and Porto Rico, as follows:

Previous experience indicates that such an appropriation could be made most useful by giving the Philippine government discretion to apply it in such proportion as they deem wise in the construction of railroads, the distribution or sale of supplies, or through the employment of labor in the construction of government wagon roads, railroads, or other public works.

There was over a million dollars expended from the Treasury for the relief of the hurricane sufferers in Porto Rico, a large part of which was expended in the employment of the people relieved.

It seemed to your committee that that was a good way to make the expenditure. Wherever you are compelled to give something for nothing it is apt to have a pauperizing effect, and if these people who are seeking this relief are able to work and willing to work, it is a correct way to spend the money and save the self-respect of those who are able to work to care for those who are unable to work, and also furnishes draft animals and supplies for those who are starving in some instances and can not make their crops without this advance.

We appropriated \$3,000,000 for Cuba at one time under conditions not so serious as these that now exist in the Philippines. We have expended over a million dollars for the hurricane sufferers in Porto Rico. Now, that is all the story and covers the ground so far as your committee had the facts in their possession.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose



there is a member in this House who desires to oppose an appropriation of whatever amount that is absolutely necessary to relieve the distress in the Philippine Islands. But I am afraid that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who is usually extremely cautious in his protection of the National Treasury, has permitted himself to be a little overreached in this case by parties who are interested in this appropriation. The very fact that this provision was first incorporated in the language we find here, including the construction of railroads, is proof that this appropriation was not originally intended for the sole purpose of relieving the distress in the Philippines.

I have no doubt but that they have distress there, and very great distress, but I have some impression—I do not know whether I got it at the hearings before the Committee on Insular Affairs or not—that there was a desire some time ago on the part of the Philippine government that the United States Government should advance a few millions to the islands as a loan to be used in developing the islands, and thereby giving employment to the people; and I would be glad to know from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether when this proposition was first advanced it was not intended to make it merely a loan to the government of the Philippine Islands for the purpose of advancing public work and the development of these islands.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman want an answer now?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I would be glad if the gentleman would answer it now.

Mr. CANNON. So far as I have any knowledge of it, I answer no. I have read the abstract that covers the report of Governor Taft. The committee at one time discussed whether they would make it reimbursable, but we thought not, as we did not do it in Porto Rico and Cuba. We thought that in the condition of the public revenues of the Philippine Islands we had better devote it to the end in view.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. If it is to be used for a similar purpose to that appropriated for Porto Rico, there can be no objection, but if there is such great necessity for the appropriation of such a large sum as \$3,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States to be sent to the Philippine Islands to be used in the construction of public highways and other public works, which, as a matter of course, will greatly advance the interests there of certain American corporations and speculators with large holdings in the islands, I say if there is such great necessity for it to relieve the people there from immediate distress, why is it that the Commissioners of the Philippine government have made no request for such an appropriation? If they have, I have not been able to find it in their report.

I desire to call the attention of the committee to the further fact that ought to be remembered in this connection. If this is for the immediate relief of the distressed, brought about in part, as they claim, from cholera in the Philippine Islands, and which was going on at the time that the report of the Philippine Commission was made, which dates back to last October, if there was so great a necessity for the appropriation to relieve the people as there was in the case of Porto Rico, why is it that this appropriation has not been made before now? Why is it that they have allowed nearly three months to expire since Congress convened without urging an appropriation, which they now claim is to relieve the people from a condition of great distress which existed as far back as October?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, that I shall consume all that time. I was saying that if there is such a great necessity for this appropriation to relieve the suffering in the islands, and this report, which only comes up to the 1st day of last October and submitted and, I believe, published in November, why is it that we have had no communication from the Commissioners since that time showing the conditions in the islands and the necessity for this appropriation now? They make no such request. It is the request of the Secretary of War, and I am free to say that I do not know whether it comes from the fact that there is great distress in the islands, or whether it comes from other certain influences at work in the Philippine Islands which would be glad to see \$3,000,000 donated by the Government for building public works and public improvements in the islands. If it is going to the immediate relief of the suffering, I say why have not the Commissioners themselves made some request? Why have the authorities asking for this appropriation made no effort to secure any evidence as to the condition of these people since last October? If it required \$3,000,000 then, perhaps

it will require \$6,000,000 now, or perhaps much less. I say that the circumstances surrounding this request are at least suspicious in some respects.

Now, it was first intended—and I am glad that my colleague has proposed his amendment, for I think it does away with a good deal of the objection to this provision—but it was originally intended that this money should be used not only to construct public highways, but to build railroads; and, strange as it may seem, there was no provision put in here authorizing them to buy the material with which to construct such railroads, unless it comes under the language "supplies," and it would hardly be embraced there, for that speaks of the necessities of the people—farming implements, etc. I suppose it was at first the intention simply to get these roads ready for the tracks—the railroad iron—and then turn them over to some corporation to build. I can hardly understand what was intended by the provision as it first stood, but it shows that there is something more they are after here than the immediate relief of the people.

If we are not to build railroads out of this appropriation of \$3,000,000—having stricken out the provision for railroads, the provision requiring their construction—it necessarily follows that we may strike out a large amount of the appropriation itself.

But so far as this appropriation may go to the immediate relief of those people, I have no objection to it. I think we are under a greater moral obligation to relieve those people in their distress than we were to relieve the people of Porto Rico; for in Porto Rico the distress was due to natural causes—to cyclones, to the storms of nature—while in the Philippine Islands much of the distress is due to the storms of American greed and American destruction that have swept all over that country. We have destroyed their houses; we have destroyed their beasts of burden; we have destroyed their property; we have destroyed their opportunity of earning a livelihood in the islands; and I feel that we are under a great moral obligation to appropriate whatever amount is necessary for their immediate relief.

But is it going to be any great relief to simply appropriate money to be expended in the construction of such public works over there as parties interested would themselves construct without this appropriation? I say, let us limit this expenditure to those things which are actually necessary—to the purchase of necessary food and clothing for the relief of the suffering, and even go further, and purchase necessary farming implements and farming animals, in order that the people may be able to plant and cultivate their crops. But I can not think that even the amount of \$3,000,000 should be appropriated for that purpose. At least, there is no evidence of that fact, and it is not asked for by the Commission.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, that if there were such great necessity for this appropriation there ought to have been a better showing before the Committee on Appropriations in favor of the item now under consideration. What have you in support of the proposition? You have nothing upon which to base this appropriation except the bare communication of the Secretary of War, stating that we ought to make an appropriation of \$3,000,000, and claiming that it is in accordance with the appropriation made to Porto Rico and to Cuba. And yet he says that in this case it should be left to the unlimited discretion of the Philippine Commission to expend these \$3,000,000 in the construction of public highways, railroads, and other public works, without making any report of their action either to the President, the Secretary of War, or Congress. We knew what the money appropriated for Porto Rico was to be used for, and in this case we do not. I repeat, there is no request anywhere from the Commissioners of the Philippine government for this appropriation. The scheme originated with the Secretary of War or the influences which prompted him.

I have no doubt that this donation will be hailed with great joy by every corporation in the islands; but I say that as we are appropriating the money of our own people, as this money is to be taken from their taxes and sent to the Philippine Islands, we are justified in appropriating only so much as may be necessary for relieving the immediate distress of the people, and only for the purpose of such relief—supplying them with those things which are absolutely necessary to enable them to go on and sustain themselves. To give them work for a few months at small wages, will leave them, perhaps, in the same condition when the work is completed.

While I do not at this time desire to offer an amendment, I shall wait until the item is further discussed; and unless we get more and better evidence of the necessity of appropriating \$3,000,000 for the people of the Philippine Islands, and more assurance that when appropriated the money will be expended, not merely to further the interests of certain American corporations and American syndicates in those islands, but for the immediate benefit and relief of the natives from the distressing conditions which we ourselves in a large part are responsible for—until

better evidence than we now have is at hand on that subject, I shall vote to reduce the appropriation, though I shall stand ready at any time to help increase it when necessary for relieving those in destitution.

One word more. The sad picture drawn by the President and the Secretary of War in their communication to Congress, in which they make an appeal for this appropriation, is in very strong contrast with that beautiful picture that has been so frequently drawn by the President of the United States upon the stump in his glittering descriptions of the wonderful prosperity and comfort and happiness which the American sword has carried everywhere among the people of the Philippine Islands. [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BENTON. Mr. Chairman, the speech of my friend from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] is in some measure a criticism of the Committee on Appropriations. When this question first came before the committee I stated in reply to a question by the chairman that I was opposed to the whole miserable business connected with the Philippines. And I was and I am; but there is no use of discussing politics in this connection. We are facing a situation. After I gave the matter some thought, this was the conclusion at which I arrived: Those people are not responsible for the conditions that surround them. We are responsible to them for conditions. The report of the Philippine Commission indicates that the beasts of burden in the island of Luzon, the carabaos, in large numbers have died; that farming, rice raising, is at a standstill.

The people need more of these animals, and they will have to be brought from the neighboring islands, and the prices have quadrupled. In a large number of places the seed rice will have to be brought to the island of Luzon; and while our information was not full, I finally assented to this appropriation because I thought it was in the interests of humanity, that these people ought to be fed and clad, and that seed ought to be brought to them from the neighboring islands; that the homes ought to be restocked with this beast of burden that they use. I confess that this is a slipshod appropriation; that we had very little testimony—in fact, none except the report of the Commission—and I thought all this appropriation ought to be used for the purposes I have indicated.

It was at my own request that the chairman of the committee has offered this amendment, so that the parties who distribute this money shall make a report to some American authority indicating what they have done with it. I had no idea that it was the intention of the Commission to build railroads with this money when their report was made. My idea was, and is now, that it ought to be for the use alone of the people who are destitute—to help feed and clothe them until they can get on their feet. I think the amendment of the chairman of our committee pretty effectually covers it, and for the reasons I have indicated alone I have agreed to this appropriation. I do not say this in the spirit of apology, but in the spirit of explanation, and to my side of the House.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I would like to amend his amendment by striking out, on page 112, line 1, the words "and other public works;" and on page 112, line 1, by striking out the word "three" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "one and a half."

The Clerk reported the amendment as follows:

Page 112, strike out the words "and other public works," line 1; and in the same line strike out the word "three" and insert the words "one and a half;" so as to read "one and a half million dollars."

Mr. CANNON. That is offered as an amendment to the amendment I offer.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I do not question for a moment the statement made here, that there is widespread distress and destitution in the Philippine Islands. I do not, however, believe that all of this destitution and distress is due to the fact that 90 per cent of the work animals in the Philippines have been destroyed by the rinderpest. But, Mr. Chairman, admitting for the sake of argument that such is the case, I think that if the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is adopted, it ought to be after it has been amended as suggested by me.

The amendment of the chairman of the committee simply strikes out the word "railroads" and leaves in the paragraph as originally drawn the words "and other public works," so that if the word "railroads" only should be stricken out, the paragraph would read "in the construction of Government wagon roads and other public works."

Now, I believe that the Philippine government would have, or at least that it would exercise, if it desired to do so, the right to build railroads under that language. I believe that the language employed here could be made to bear that construction, and that the striking out of the word "railroads" does not materially

affect the paragraph as it now stands. But, Mr. Chairman, if it be true, as I suppose will be contended, that the Philippine Commission would not have the right to construct railroads if that word is stricken out, then surely it is not necessary that the appropriation should be \$3,000,000. If the railroads are not really to be built, then there is no reason for the expenditure of such a sum of money as \$3,000,000.

I believe that if this appropriation is made the larger part of the money will not be expended in direct disbursements to the people for their needs. I apprehend that it would be expended for "other public works." If that be so, surely, Mr. Chairman, there ought to be a provision in this bill requiring the Philippine government to refund that money to the United States. It ought to be in the form of a loan and not in the form of a gift. If it is to be used to enable the people of the Philippines to construct public works, they should be required to return it.

We have been told over and over again, Mr. Chairman, within the past four years that these islands were immensely rich. We have been told that their resources were almost inexhaustible. We have been told that instead of being a charge upon the people of the United States they would be a source of wealth and great profit to them. I can understand how some visitation of providence may temporarily have deprived them of the ability to earn their bread; but if it is true that the islands are as rich as we have been told that they are, then surely there is no reason why we should give them money to be expended in permanent public works and not for the purpose of relieving their immediate necessities.

Certainly, if they are as rich in resources as we are told they are, so much of the money appropriated as is to be used for public works, and not dispensed as a charity to destitute individuals, should be returned to the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I hope that will be given.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if this money is not to be expended in permanent improvements, if it is not to be expended for railroads, then there is no necessity for so large an amount as \$3,000,000. If \$3,000,000, in other words, is sufficient to relieve the immediate necessities of the people, and also to enable the commissioners to build railroads and other public works, then if we eliminate from the uses that it is to be applied to, the railroad building, the amount of the appropriation should be correspondingly reduced.

Therefore I hope that the gentleman from Illinois, if he earnestly desires that this money shall not be expended in the construction of railroads, will adopt the first suggestion which I have made, and that is to strike out the words "and other public works," because unless that is done under that language the Philippine Commission can build railroads if they so desire. So that if it really be the purpose of the gentleman to prevent the Philippine Commission from building railroads he should not object to the employment of such words as will make plain and clear his intention. I submit, therefore, that unless the words "and other public works" are stricken out the amendment of the gentleman should provide that any part of this appropriation expended in any way other than for the purpose of relieving the destitution of the people should be returned to the United States Government.

So far as it may be necessary to expend this money in relieving the immediate and pressing necessities of the people of that island, I am willing that they shall have it as a matter of pure charity, and that they shall not be required to return it. But if it is to be expended, or part of it, in public improvements, then I submit that the Philippine government ought to make it good to the United States. If no part of it is to be expended in building railroads and in making public improvements, then, Mr. Chairman, I submit that a million and a half dollars will be amply sufficient to relieve the distress of which we are told.

But I rather imagine that is contemplated, indeed, that it is really the purpose of the gentleman that a large part of the \$3,000,000 shall be expended in public works, such as harbor improvements, and that that is why he will not consent to accept my amendment. I understand, of course, that such expenditures would give employment to labor; but the government would be the gainer thereby and to that extent should reimburse the United States. The inauguration of the policy of donating money to the Philippine government for public works, is an admission on the part of those who inaugurate it that the treasury of that government will never be in a condition to return the money to the people of the United States.

And if it will never be in that condition, why, I ask any



rational man, should we longer hold the islands? If there is never to be any prospect that they can, out of their own revenues, provide for the public improvements and public works that are necessary to their welfare, the sooner we give them their independence the better it will be for us. If their revenues are never to be sufficient for that purpose, and the United States Government is to be eternally called upon to furnish the money to construct public buildings, dig out harbors, and perchance, build railroads, the sooner we part company with them the better. It is bad enough that we must buy the indigent inhabitants work animals, when the rinderpest kills such as they may have; bad enough to have to provide them with the necessities of life. That, however, I am willing to do under existing circumstances. I am not willing to vote money to be expended in public works.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana rose.

Mr. CANNON. How much time does the gentleman from Indiana want?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois did not ask for general debate, I should like to have about fifteen minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Let us compromise on ten, and I will take five, and then I will ask for a vote.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understood that the gentleman from Illinois was to ask unanimous consent for general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I did; but objection was made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. CANNON. Now I will ask unanimous consent to close the debate upon this paragraph and all amendments in fifteen minutes—ten minutes to the gentleman and five minutes to myself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to close debate on the paragraph and pending amendments in fifteen minutes, ten minutes to be given to the gentleman from Indiana and five minutes to himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I object, Mr. Chairman, until—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate be closed in fifteen minutes on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will not the gentleman make that longer than that, so that we can have consideration of this amendment? I do not think that there is any factional opposition to it.

Mr. CANNON. I will make it twenty minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is not as much time as you proposed in the beginning.

Mr. CANNON. But my friend must understand there was objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I did not think the objection would interfere with your liberality.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments be closed in twenty minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I desire to amend that and make it thirty minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I hope the gentleman will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS] moves as an amendment that the time be thirty minutes.

Mr. STEELE. I move to amend that by making it five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I think twenty minutes will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana will be in the third degree, which is not in order.

Mr. STEELE. Then I wish the amendment to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman had better accept thirty minutes, and it will save the time of having a vote by tellers.

Mr. STEELE. Well, we do not want to save time.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I ask unanimous consent to close all debate in thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to close debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto in thirty minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. A parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will that leave open an opportunity, or have I now the right to move to strike out all after the words "construction of wagon roads, etc.?" I do not hear the words of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES], but I understand they both allow this money to be expended in public improvements simply to give employment to these people and not because needed; hence I object to both.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion would not be in order now.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. But if the request is granted, amendments may be offered after the thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. They can be offered at the end of the thirty minutes, but can not be debated.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. They can be offered at the end of thirty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. But not debated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Let me suggest that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we approach the subject of this legislation impressed with its importance and with a desire, conservatively, to do all that need be done for the relief of a distressing situation.

The results of insular government is seen in this proposition to vote \$3,000,000 from the United States Treasury for the relief of the people in the Philippine Islands.

I regret the necessity that, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, justifies his recommendation to Congress to vote this amount. It is unfortunate for the nation and for all our people.

Could not this result of our government in the Tropics have been foreseen? True, but can the end be foretold?

This is a distress measure, but with the ever-recurring causes for additional appropriations they may be ever present with us.

True we appropriated for reindeers in Alaska, for calamity and flood sufferers, and such like, but the sums were moderate in comparison and the occasions were such as are not likely to occur again. But here we have the seeds of a policy as to insular possessions which, if persevered in, will cast in the shadows our Indian policy from the first years of our government till now, and about which so much criticism has been heard.

These conditions are upon us. The story of ruin and want are vividly told by the Philippine Commission and the Secretary of War. Can we resist this appeal for aid when we are measurably responsible for it and have been led into a condition that invites it? There are various schools of thought, it seems, when it comes to the causes for industrial stagnation in the Philippines.

Many gentlemen state, and the chairman of the Insular Committee [Mr. COOPER] within a few weeks stated on this floor, that great industrial distress has come to the Philippines because of the failure of Congress to give the islands a stable currency. It is difficult, of course, for us to determine with nicety, so far away, how much distress is attributable to money disorders and how much comes from disease and death to man and to animal life. This difficulty only accentuates our misfortunes.

Is this \$3,000,000 an opening wedge, a forerunner of appropriations for like purposes in years to come? In a proper construction of the McEnery resolution, which passed the Senate in 1899 as an interpretation of the Spanish treaty by which we acquired the Philippines, can be found a solution of the difficulties that now are brought so clearly to our attention. I send it to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the citizens of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands.*

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I presume that I am recognized for ten minutes. I would like to ask the gentleman if time will be yielded to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS]?

Mr. CANNON. I will ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman may be extended so that he may have ten minutes altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana may be extended by five minutes, so that he may have ten minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I only ask that because my colleague on the Insular Committee [Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois] desires to have five minutes, and I do not want to occupy more than ten minutes.

Mr. CANNON. That will be five minutes for the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. All right.

Mr. Chairman, this lamentable condition prevails in the Philippine Islands, and we must do something. To make a loan would set a dangerous precedent, and all of our Territories would come and ask for money, and we would be the bankers of our Territories and colonial possessions.

I am inclined to think, if facts of fabulous wealth are as they

have been stated, that it would be better to loan than to give, even in their distress. For years we were told that the Philippine land was rich, and that the richness of field and mine afforded a great field for American industry. Now, here they come to us as supplicants for three millions of money to relieve them from a distress that the richness of that country and wealth of its inhabitants can not relieve.

The Philippine Commissioners report that leprosy abounds; that 30,000 lepers are in the islands and 100 cases in Manila alone. Will we not be asked to appropriate for them? Cholera in the Philippine Islands with a record from March 23, 1902, to November 1, of that year, of 107,250 cases and 69,983 deaths, being a mortality rate of 65.25 per cent; and Governor Taft's last report predicts 100,000 deaths from cholera alone. Bubonic plague in the Philippine Islands with a death rate of 199 in 1900 and 432 in 1901 in Manila alone.

Will we in the future be asked to appropriate for these? The report says that "smallpox existed in the islands from time immemorial, and was one of the most prominent causes of death among the Filipinos at the date of the American invasion."

Hog and chicken cholera, the report says, existed contemporaneously with the rinderpest. This is the result and misfortune that is upon us—islands where man and beast are afflicted with all the diseases that flesh is heir to. I hold in my hand an article from the North American Review of recent date, by Brewster Cameron, delegate to Washington from the allied chambers of commerce of the Philippine Islands, and will give some excerpts:

To promote the permanent welfare of the Philippines it is necessary, first, that we should have an absolutely stable currency.

A stable currency is the only relief from this deplorable condition of affairs, which is being misconstrued by the natives as a conspiracy to increase the cost of the necessities of life to the poor.

Every consideration of trade and commerce, political expediency, and national honor demands that Congress should give a stable currency to the Philippines. \* \* \* such a stable currency as has given a stupendous impetus to every business interest in the United States.

This writer and representative, throughout a long article, sets forth the cause of distress, but carefully avoids giving his sanction to any money system except in his language "such a stable currency as has given a stupendous impetus to every business interest in the United States," which implies American money.

This "accredited representative" covers another subject of vital concern to us in this legislation.

He says:

A Filipino business house in the city of Manila owns several plantations. On one of these plantations they have for years employed 30,000 Filipino laborers. They had 12,000 carabaos, of which all but 50 were swept away within the past year.

And further—

Prior to the passage of the Philippine act the owners of this plantation could have mortgaged it (75,000 acres) to a corporation for the money required to restock it with carabaos, but as the Philippine act limits the holdings of any corporation to 2,500 acres it is now impossible for the owners to do so.

Under the most favorable circumstances, with laws encouraging to agriculture, it will require approximately five years fully to revive the agricultural industry. Under the present law, which has paralyzed every agricultural interest in the islands, the development of the Philippines will be indefinitely delayed.

The present law, as stated above, limits the ownership of land by corporations to 2,500 acres. It is known to everyone who has made even a superficial study of the business that a 2,500-acre plantation will not furnish enough cane to operate economically a modern sugar-milling plant. Under the operations of this unfortunate law, men who are rich in lands, but without money, have been unable to get corporate interests to equip their plantations with modern sugar plants.

It is a misfortune not only to the Filipino people, but to the people of the United States, that any law should indefinitely delay the agricultural and industrial development of the Philippines; and corporations have become such an essential element in conducting large business affairs in modern times that it is impossible to secure the necessary amount of capital to develop the islands except through corporations.

This new light gives a limitation on corporation expansion as a fruitful cause of present distress. How, by an appropriation of \$3,000,000 without carefully guarding its expenditure, do you prevent it from going to the corporations? From this view point they are the life in the islands. You will not find any agricultural industries in the Philippine Islands save the kind that we have in the Hawaiian Islands—great landed estates. The burden of their complaint to-day is that a large measure of distress comes because land holdings are limited to 2,500 acres, whereas they want from ten to twenty and a hundred thousand acres. How will you prevent these sums appropriated from going to the great corporations, which in a business way seem to control, unless you guard this appropriation as the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] designs to guard it?

Mr. Chairman, whether this distress comes from the failure to give them a stable currency, or whether it comes from diseases in the island, or is the result of war, or from all these conditions, it is conceded that we must do something. Guard this appro-

priation against the unworthy and make it what the Government wants it to be—a distress measure. So far should we go and no further. Our people are unfortunate enough in being compelled by the colonial policy of the Government to grant this aid, without adding the loss that would come from diverting it into channels that it is not intended to go.

Mr. Chairman, I had the Clerk read the Senate resolution to show how clear our way is outlined and how easy our course would have been if we had paralleled in the Philippines our course in Cuba.

We gave to Cuba her liberty and gave her a God speed on her way as a Republic. Cuba does not come in distress or as a mendicant asking for alms. The only aid she asks is that which will be of equal benefit to us.

Our action toward Cuba may be followed with profit and advantage in the Philippine Islands. [Applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, whether we made a good bargain or a bad bargain in negotiating for the Philippine Archipelago cuts no figure in this discussion. The proposition to vote \$3,000,000 to the people of the Philippine Archipelago is one simply for the relief of a condition of destitution that is the result of a succession of misfortunes for which this Government is no more responsible than it was for the hurricane in Porto Rico, or for the condition of destitution that existed in the island of Cuba, or for the plagues of Egypt in the days of Pharaoh.

When we first obtained control of the Philippine Archipelago there was a condition of insurrection, of practical anarchy. The administration of this Government in the Philippines is an open book, and it is a matter of recent history. But by a succession of misfortunes, particularly the rinderpest, whereby practically all of the beasts of burden in the Philippine Islands were destroyed, and a condition of poverty and destitution exists, such as appeals to the sense of magnanimity and charity of every citizen of this country. There is no need of undertaking to disguise the legislation under consideration or of attempting to construe it into a loan or a business proposition; it is a proposition to relieve destitution, pure and simple, a charitable act. I have listened to the criticisms made by various speakers on the measure, and I think none of them possess a particle of merit.

The amount of the appropriation was fixed upon, as I understand, after a careful examination and thorough consideration of the situation by the Committee on Appropriations. That committee advised itself by the best means obtainable and concluded that \$3,000,000 ought to be appropriated to relieve the present exigency.

The provision contained in the bill, that the money may be used for the direct relief of the people in the way of purchasing supplies or, in the discretion of the Philippine Commission, in employing labor for the construction of public works, is a wise provision. The apprehension of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] that the term "public works" would be so construed as to embrace "railroads" is utterly without foundation.

The construction of railroads in our politics, in our civilization, is not by any manner of means regarded as the execution of a public work. But the term "railroads" will be stricken from the provision; and if the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia should prevail, it would prevent the Philippine government from using any part of this money in the construction of school-houses, of public buildings, or in the improvement of rivers and harbors, or for the securing of many other conveniences for the benefit of the people of those islands that might be obtained and at the same time afford relief to the destitute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. If the provision had remained as originally drawn, and the Philippine government had constructed railroads out of this appropriation, would not those railroads have been public works under the Philippine government?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In my judgment, if the provision had remained as it was originally drawn it would not have conferred upon the Philippine government authority to construct railroads as public enterprises. I do not believe that under existing law the government of the Philippine Islands has any such power. I do not believe that Congress has conferred upon that government the power to build, own, and operate railroads, and if it had not done so, then, with the provision as it originally stood, there would be no authority on the part of the Philippine government to use any of the money to be appropriated in the construction of railroads.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. It is true, is it not, that the Secretary of War recommended that money should be used in that way?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know; I am not familiar with the recommendations—

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The chairman of the committee read a statement from the report, to that effect—that the Secretary of War had so recommended.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I am not familiar with the recommendations of the Secretary of War.



Mr. JONES of Virginia. That statement was read here.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This provision does not confer upon the insular government authority to do anything which it would not otherwise have authority, except to disburse the relief fund.

I am discussing now simply the question of the power of the insular government to build, own, and operate railroads without express authority from Congress to do so; and I take the position that the government there has no such power, and that this bill confers no such power.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. If this bill declared that the government there could, in its discretion, use this money in the construction of railroads, would not such a provision confer the power?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think not; not in view of the manner the provision was written in the bill.

I believe it would be a grave mistake to reduce this appropriation a single dollar; and I believe it would be a more serious mistake to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, and deny to the insular government the right to use this fund in the employment of idle laborers upon necessary public works—enterprises which would go to the benefit of all the people of those islands. Such an amendment as the gentleman proposes would practically convert the provision into a charitable fund to be doled out by some public benefactor without regard to the real welfare of the people.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Would not the gentleman be in favor of requiring that in the case of each expenditure there should be given the name of the person receiving the money and the purpose to which it was applied?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I do not know that I would go into such details as that. That is an aspect of the proposition that I have not considered. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] requires the governor of the archipelago to submit to Congress a detailed statement of the expenditures, and that is a sufficient protection to the people both of this country and the Philippines.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] desire to use any of his time now?

Mr. CANNON. I should like to close the debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. How much time does the gentleman expect to occupy?

Mr. CANNON. About ten minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. If the gentleman wishes to yield time to anyone else, I shall be glad to have him do so now.

Mr. CANNON. I want to close the debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Does the gentleman desire to use all of his time in closing?

Mr. CANNON. I hardly think I shall; but I may do so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] to strike out the language "and other public works." While that language may not be so construed as to include railroads, yet it might be.

There is no question that a great deal of this money would be used in the construction of public works in cities and towns—in building street railways, electric-light plants, and various improvements of that kind, which would necessarily enhance greatly the value of property in such city or town and its vicinity; and if this appropriation be made in the terms contained in the bill it is easy to imagine the great scramble that there would be among those who have large interests in those cities and the surrounding country to have this money, or a part of it, expended so as to advance their interests; and in that way much, if not most, of the money would probably be used where the most of the Americans reside—where the most of American capital is invested—while, on the other hand, if we strike out the words "other public works" a large portion of this appropriation would be distributed along the public highways and among the agricultural classes, who stand in greater need of it. For this reason I think the language should be stricken out.

Now, while I have great faith in this Commission, yet when I see in their recommendation to Congress that they desire that a single corporation or a single individual in the Philippine Islands shall be allowed to own 25,000 acres of land I can not agree that all their sympathy is with the common people who are now suffering such distress in that country. This appropriation, I want to say, if made for public works, will be a very sad commentary indeed upon the flattering promises and statements made by a great many distinguished gentlemen in this country as to the wonderful resources, valuable lands, fine timbers, and precious metals of those islands.

If they are all that those who favored their annexation have claimed for them, if they are so inviting to American capital and American investments, why is it necessary to appropriate out of the money raised by taxes from the people of our own country

millions of dollars in order to carry on public works which the capital there in the islands ought to conduct? I say, Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning, that the word "public works" ought to be stricken out. This appropriation ought to be reduced and limited to such expenditures as are necessary for those who are in distress in the islands, in need of the necessities of life, that more of these animals which they use in planting and cultivating their crops may be purchased, and more of such things as are required by the natives.

I was desirous to see the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations consent that this appropriation should be reduced. Since a part of the objects for which it was to be expended is to be stricken out, it seems to me it necessarily follows that it might be reduced, and knowing, as I do, that the chairman of the committee is acting in the best of good faith in this matter and would not want to appropriate a single dollar for the purpose of aiding any private enterprise, but solely for the benefit of those who are in actual distress, I still hope that he will consent to a reduction of the amount of this appropriation, and if it becomes necessary hereafter to appropriate further from the Treasury of the United States to relieve the inhabitants of those islands from the great distress which we, in years gone by, have spent millions and hundreds of millions in bringing upon them, I for one stand ready at any time to appropriate for such a righteous purpose. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, just a few words in closing this debate, and then I will ask for a vote. What is this proposition? It is for the relief of distress in the Philippine Islands. How is it to be expended? Under the direction and discretion of the Philippine government, Governor Taft, Commissioner Wright, and the other Commissioners, in such proportions as they deem wise, in the purchase and distribution of farm implements, animals, supplies, necessities of life. What else? And through the employment of labor in the construction of government wagon roads or other public works. There is the whole story. But gentlemen flap their wings and say, "We told you that these people would cost something, and you said it was a rich land, so you have got now to relieve distress." I call the attention of my honorable colleague to the fact that in my State and in his, in the district which he represents, in the presence of great floods, his constituents and my fellow-citizens have been relieved.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Yes; but they were furnished the necessities of life.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely, and at the expense of the public Treasury—without work, and it was well done. It would have been better done if they had been given work, because there would have been no element of pauperization in it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I would ask my colleague one other question. The bill as amended will provide that this money, a part of it, may be expended in employing them on public works.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Where is the material to come from with which to construct these public works unless out of this appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. Spades and earth and harbors and roads and anything else that will coax the people to work for that which they receive, and thereby, that far, preserve their manhood. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am not afraid to trust Governor Taft, and I call the attention of other friends whose districts are along the Ohio River, in States upon both banks, along the Mississippi, and away up in the Red River district of the North, to the fact that relief has been given there, and yet this is a God-favored land. I call attention further to the fact that in the early settlements of this continent, in the days of the colonies, there was year after year of starvation with our ancestors. Yet it was a great land.

Now, what is the fact in respect to the Philippine Islands? Ninety percent of the animals that are used for farming over there are dead. What else? They have had cholera. A hundred thousand of those 10,000,000 people are dead from that epidemic in the last ten months. What else? They have had almost four years of war and brigandage, and now at last have order and a degree of civil and military government under the Army and under the Taft Commission. I will not stop here to bring up what has happened in other days. I will not stop here to say what has been said on this floor in former Congresses in the House and in the Senate. I will not stop to charge that such criticism as came from that side and the similar side in the Senate, perchance, continued the war and helped to bring about a part of this condition. That is not necessary. That is past, and although your political handbooks teemed with cries of imperialism there was not one of you who was brave enough, when you met your patriotic citizens in the last campaign, to act up to that handbook and your criticisms in the House and in the Senate during the last session of Congress—not one. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Yes, willing to do it; think maybe it had better be cut down to a million and a half; but so afraid that the words "public works" might enable Taft, while he was keeping them from becoming paupers and preserving their manhood, to do some work that might be to the benefit of some rich man or some corporation, you would rather nothing should be done. My heavens! I would rather they would carry bricks a hundred feet and carry them back again, if they are able, and render some equivalent if they are able to do it, than to have it for nothing. And gentlemen are afraid of railroads. I struck out railroads, because I knew that to some of my friends railroads were like water to a mad dog.

I do not think you can build any railroads with this appropriation. I think the gentleman from Indiana is right upon that proposition. However, I would be glad if by a liberal grant of land—and nearly all the lands in the Philippine Islands are public lands—and by all proper encouragement, private capital could be invested and a railroad could split open every island of the archipelago. Then civilization would go on at a greatly accelerated pace. I am not afraid of the development of the country or the construction of railroads, but we can take care of that. First, the Commission reports this condition and the recommendation comes. I have a letter in addition to that from Governor Taft, written within the last two months, showing that the condition is quite up to the report and probably worse. I have not had it read. The report is sufficient. Other gentlemen have received letters to the same effect. I ask this side of the House and that side of the House to stop haggling and criticising and splitting hairs, and I ask them to vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia, and adopt the amendment I had the honor to offer, striking out the railroads and providing for a report to the Secretary of War. Let us move on, then, with the consideration of the bill. I am ready for a vote. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman's interpretation of the distress existing over there. Here is one case to which I call his attention:

A Filipino business house in the city of Manila owns several plantations. On one of these plantations they have for years employed 80,000 Philippine laborers. They had about 12,000 carabaos, of which all but 50 were swept away within the past year.

Would these people obtain part of this appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know whether they would or not, but they would or would not in the sound judgment of Governor Taft and the Commission, either by gift or sale. We made it broad enough and gave them plenary discretion in the premises. I do not know about the case to which the gentleman refers. If it was apt to give it to them and it would relieve more distress that way than any other, or to sell to them, I have no doubt that Governor Taft and the Commission would properly perform their duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate on the paragraph is now closed.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to say just a few words.

Mr. CANNON. I hope consent will be granted. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee that prepared this bill.

Mr. McRAE. A couple of minutes will do me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment to reduce this appropriation will not be adopted. It ought to be voted down. The limitations proposed by the chairman of the committee are entirely proper, and with those limitations I hope that this side of the House will be satisfied and will support this appropriation. I regret that we have to do it, as all of us must regret it, but this is a distress call for relief. The only medium through which we could get information—the Commission and the Secretary of War—have emphasized the necessity for this relief, and we can not afford, in the face of such distress like this, I say to my friends on this side, to refuse our support, and I hope that both sides of this House will give the relief asked for by those who are in a position to know what is needed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. As the gentleman is on the committee, I should like to ask him this question: Has any request ever come from the Commissioners of the Philippine Islands for this appropriation?

Mr. McRAE. I understand it has, and that emphatically.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I have not been able to find it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

The question being taken, on a division demanded by Mr. JONES of Virginia, there were—ayes 21, noes 56. Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The amendment was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose, and Mr. DALZELL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

On February 11, 1903:

H. J. Res. 184. Joint resolution requesting State authorities to cooperate with Census Office in securing a uniform system of birth and death registration; and

H. R. 14899. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate The National Florence Crittenton Mission."

#### SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For continuing the establishment in the vicinity of Manila, P. I., of a military post, including the construction of barracks, quarters for officers, hospital, storehouses, and other buildings, as well as water supply, lighting, sewerage, and drainage necessary for the accommodation of a garrison of two full regiments of infantry, two squadrons of cavalry, and two batteries of artillery, to be immediately available, \$1,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that paragraph. My point of order is that there is no existing law authorizing this expenditure. I do not know of any act of Congress which provides for the establishment of a military post in the Philippine Islands. My recollection of the matter is that there was in some appropriation bill an item of this sort, appropriating \$500,000 for a military post in the Philippines, but that it went out on a point of order, and that the gentleman from Illinois then offered an amendment of an entirely different character, not an amendment providing for the establishment of a military post. Unless there is some subsequent act of Congress which the gentleman can cite me to, I think that this point is well taken.

Mr. CANNON. I read as follows:

For the establishment in the vicinity of Manila, Philippine Islands, of a military post, including construction of barracks, quarters for officers, hospital, storehouses, and other buildings, as well as water supply, lighting, sewerage, and drainage, necessary for the accommodation of a garrison of two full regiments of infantry, two squadrons of cavalry, and two batteries of artillery, to be available until expended, \$500,000.

Expressly established. The appropriation not limited, and it is a continuation.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. Am I to understand that the item passed the House in the form of the amendment introduced and that it was changed in the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect about that. It is the law.

Mr. JONES of Virginia. The gentleman knows very well, and I know he does not want to be disingenuous about this. I think the gentleman does remember distinctly that the \$500,000 reported by his committee went out on a point of order, and that he introduced it as an amendment in another form and that he afterwards criticised the Democrats for not wanting to vote, as he alleged, to provide for the comfort of our soldiers in the Philippines. The gentleman can not have forgotten this.

Mr. CANNON. I recollect that was on a bill pending in the House. I thought that they ought to be criticised; and when they bared their skin, to be switched a little, I did switch them twice to the best of my ability; but this is like I have read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the paragraph is in order, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the President, December 2, 1902, said to Congress:

No policy ever entered into by the American people has vindicated itself in more signal manner than the policy of holding the Philippines.

We have just passed a provision appropriating three millions to remove distress of the people in the Philippine Islands. We are now appropriating \$1,000,000 to build a military post. Four million at a clip—because "holding the Philippines." As to what else this bill carries, or will carry before we get through with it, I do not know. It is hard to tell.

This reminds me of a conversation, almost a prophecy, that I had with the governor of Ceylon, Mr. Ridgeway, the well-known and able governor of the Crown colony of Ceylon, said to be one of the best-regulated colonies that England has. I wrote it out a few minutes after it occurred.

I shall read my notes:

On August 23, 1901, I called on the governor of Ceylon, Mr. Ridgeway. He said: "I see your Congressional party is going to the Philippines to investigate conditions there." "Yes," I replied; "not as a committee, but as individual members of Congress."

The governor then said:

"What," asked he, "are you going to do with them—give them autonomy, home rule, or hold them as, what we call, a crown colony? I do not see what you want with them; they will be a great nuisance to you, an everlasting and



unprofitable expense, and force you to police and protect it with a large army and navy at an enormous expense of money, life, and tropical disease, and your people will soon get tired of all that.

"Then, your Constitution is in direct conflict with colonialism, your form of government is opposed to colonies, and your people will never mix with them. Instead of being a source of strength to you, it really weakens your Government; this spreading out of your territory in this way lessens your strength in war, and lays you open to wars and all sorts of complications you would otherwise avoid.

"Why, if any war against the United States arose with, say, England or any strong country on this part of the globe, these islands would be first attacked; we would just go right over and take them. These islands are incapable of self-defense. You must defend them all the time, and as they are so far away from the base of supplies they amount to a weakness to your country, a constant menace and nuisance.

"You are not, as England is, cramped for room for your people; you have lots."

Now, I have a similar statement, Mr. Chairman, from a distinguished English military officer—a colonel.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. Is he reading from Genesis or Revelations or Job?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I observe it is a revelation to the gentleman from Illinois. [Laughter.] Nothing unusual, either.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not criticising this million-dollar item. It is a necessity. It is understood they need this. Our boys are there rotting, and our people must go there because we are "holding the Philippines," and we are now paying for the "holding."

Now, here is this governor of Ceylon, whose prophecy is almost literally fulfilled, although it has been to a tenfold greater ratio than he portrayed it.

It is a prophecy which I had made in protesting against our colonialism—"holding the Philippine Islands." Read Governor Taft's letter, read Secretary Root's report, and then read Governor Ridgeway's words, and see how they tally.

Now, this measure is giving the government over there the power to build "government roads," a thing that the gentleman has not favored so far for our own people; but is giving them the opportunity there of building government roads. For what? To put the people to work.

Now, I have here an official document from Governor Taft, part of the last war report, showing that there was built 32 miles of road, such as the Benguet road, and that it cost \$116,000 of United States money to do so. They made a "wagon way," the report says, and worked six months. It cost them that amount of money to build 32 miles of wagon road which is nothing more than a mere pathway; and this was one road only. That is the way they build roads in the Philippine Islands—to put the people to work.

Now, we ought to give them a homestead and we ought to open up the 70,000,000 acres that the Government has of public lands in the Philippine Islands. Let us give them that mule—and I believe we have all heard about that mule—and really give them a mule, and really give them a farm and tools and seed, food and raiment, really give them something to do and put them at it. Do not adopt our unfortunate Indian policy. The church, the United States, and a few rich men in the Philippine Islands own the land. The masses have no land. Give it to them and at once. They are an agricultural people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have got to build a big navy there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CANNON. I object.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Just a moment. The present naval bill carries, I am told, \$30,000,000 increase, caused by "holding to the Philippine Islands"—going to the other side of the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TAWNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 17202, the sundry civil appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

AMENDING SECTION 3394, REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO TOBACCO.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted a privileged report on House bill 16457, to amend section 3394 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tobacco; which was ordered printed, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, as gentlemen are well aware, to-morrow is set aside for business on the Private Calendar under

the rule. I am informed that it is desired by members on both sides to go on with the business that has been under consideration to-day, the sundry civil bill, and I ask unanimous consent that Saturday be substituted for to-morrow for business on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks that Saturday be substituted for to-morrow for business on the Private Calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a concurrent resolution of the Senate; which the Clerk read, as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 65.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 569) to establish the department of commerce and labor the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to insert in line 12 of the third paragraph of section 6, after the word "interstate," the word "commerce."

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HEPBURN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

VALDEMAR POULSEN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 13307) for the relief of Valdemar Poulsen with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SULZER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

EXTENDING HOMESTEAD LAWS IN ALASKA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 12098) to amend section 1 of the act of Congress approved May 14, 1898, entitled "An act extending the homestead laws and providing for a right of way for railroads in the district of Alaska," with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senate be nonconcurring in, and that the House ask for a conference.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to insist on a point of order, although I think the bill is subject to a point of order.

Mr. LACEY. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. LOUD. I ask the gentleman from Iowa to let the bill go over. It is a very long amendment, affecting some of our people, and I ask that it be allowed to go over.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will go over.

Mr. LACEY. And retaining its place upon the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. It will retain its place upon the Speaker's table.

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 6961) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County, and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF COMMERCE WITH FOREIGN NATIONS AND AMONG THE STATES.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the report on the bill S. 7053, the so-called Elkins bill, has been filed, and I desire in behalf of the minority to submit the minority views.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has a right to do that, and it will go on the same Calendar with the majority report.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16534. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Durham;

H. R. 7110. An act granting an increase of pension to Aurelia M. Powers;

H. R. 10678. An act for the relief of the Florida Brewing Company;

H. R. 16731. An act permitting the town of Montrose, Colo., to enter 160 acres of land for reservoir and water purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act granting an increase of pension to Grace A. Negley;

H. R. 10095. An act for the relief of Levi L. Reed;

H. R. 8653. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the

military record of Charles F. Woodford and grant him an honorable discharge;

H. R. 5101. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Contal;

H. R. 15911. An act granting an increase of pension to George N. McMurry;

H. R. 12952. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to the Rockford Cemetery Association to certain lands for cemetery purposes;

H. R. 9107. An act granting a pension to Austin A. Vore;

H. R. 10355. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Smithson;

H. R. 12411. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bart;

H. R. 7642. An act providing for the holding of terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States at Kansas City, Kans., and for other purposes;

H. R. 10672. An act granting an increase of pension to Ada S. Kaempfer;

H. R. 15400. An act granting an increase of pension to Enos Turner;

H. R. 14845. An act granting a pension to Margaret Snyder;

H. R. 6332. An act granting a pension to Michael Conlon;

H. R. 15757. An act granting a pension to Frances C. Brogan; and

H. R. 14164. An act for the relief of Charles W. Carr.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 7185. An act to authorize the board of commissioners for the Connecticut bridge and highway district to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River at Hartford, in the State of Connecticut;

S. 7159. An act authorizing the Memphis, Helena and Louisiana Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across St. Francis River, in the State of Arkansas;

S. 5678. An act providing for the record of deeds and other conveyances and instruments of writing in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; and

S. 7223. An act to authorize the Pittsburg, Carnegie and Western Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. HENRY of Texas, Mr. WOOTEEN was given five days longer than the five days heretofore fixed for printing remarks on the trust bill, he being unavoidably absent.

#### WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. GIBSON was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of John H. Roberts, Fifty-seventh Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw all papers from the House Committee on Invalid Pensions connected with the bill S. 5931, the bill having passed the Senate and not having been adversely reported upon in the House.

And then (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes), on motion of Mr. PAYNE the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the French spoliation cases relating to the sloop *Sally Maria*, John Sells, master, against The United States; to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of John H. Vaught, administrator of estate of John Sullivan, against The United States; to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of A. J. Williford, administrator of estate of Lavina Williams, against The United States; to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of R. Gray Williams, administrator of estate of Israel Cobourn, against The United States; to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of G. D. Hearn, administrator of estate of William McK. Hall, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Asa Atkins, administrator of estate of James M. Atkins, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Duncan Darroch, administrator of estate of Daniel Darroch, against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the treasurer of the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Railway Company, transmitting the report for the year ended December 31, 1902—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GRAHAM, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16505) to so amend section 64 of "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii" as to remodel certain sections of the election law of said Territory, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3762); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17157) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to gather statistics relating to the production of cotton and wheat, and raising revenue to defray the expense thereof, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3763); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16278) to authorize the construction of a telephone line from the mainland to Plum Island, thence to Washington Island, Wisconsin, in aid of the preservation of life and property, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3764); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7053) to further regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 3765); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16457) to amend section 3394 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to tobacco, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3766); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4812) granting a pension to Addison Arnold, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3755); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6373) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Lockhart, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3756); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 6653) granting a pension to Halvor Paulsen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3757); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to



which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7186) granting a pension to Mary C. Couch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 8758); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7277) granting an increase of pension to Elbert H. Dagnall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3759); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MONDELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5879) to remove the charge of desertion from the army record of Eli Hibbard, submitted the views of the minority, to accompany report (No. 8658, part 2); which said views were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 17390) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Bogue Chitto, in the parish of Washington, State of Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 17391) to fix the rank of certain officers of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 17392) to provide for the purchase of a site upon which to erect a post-office building at Butler, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 17393) to authorize registers and receivers of United States land offices to furnish transcripts of their records to individuals—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 17394) for survey and estimate of cost of improving St. Marys River, Georgia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 17395) requiring mail carriers on star routes to take all mail deposited in roadside boxes and mail it in the nearest post-office along the route—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BARTLETT: A resolution (H. Res. 445) to pay to Mrs. John L. Sheppard the sum of \$35.47—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. MONDELL: A joint resolution of the legislature of Wyoming, indorsing the irrigation investigation of the United States Department of Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: A resolution by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to Castle Island—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 17396) granting an increase of pension to James W. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOY: A bill (H. R. 17397) granting an increase of pension to Ida J. Peixotto—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 17398) for the relief of Eleanor B. Cayton—to the Committee on War Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKETT: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church of Dunbar, Nebr., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CANNON: Resolutions of the Trades and Labor Council and of Cigar Makers' Union No. 80, both of Danville, Ill., favoring House bill 16457, relating to gifts in connection with the sale of tobacco and cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolutions of the Central Trades and Labor Union and Freight Handlers' Union No. 7556, of Providence, R. I., for the repeal of the desert-land law and the commutation clause of the homestead act—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CONNELL: Resolutions of the legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Pennsylvania in favor of

the passage of the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the same, in favor of House bill 15990, known as the employers' liability bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the same, urging the passage of the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring increased trade relations with Canada—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the same, favoring the purchase of military camp site at Somerset, Pa.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Philadelphia Association of Union ex-Prisoners of War, asking for additional pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Pittsburg Lodge, No. 110, Sons of Benjamin, Pittsburg, Pa., against the exclusion of Jewish immigrants at the port of New York—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAYTON: Petition of 20 citizens of Fairmont, W. Va., for the improvement of the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: Resolution of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, in reference to House bill No. 16876, to provide a United States naval reserve—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DRAPER: Circular of National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, relating to the need of legislation to deny use of United States mails to unworthy and unauthorized insurance companies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of the American Chamber of Commerce, of Paris, France, in favor of the adoption of the metric system in the United States—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of James W. Hall, of Company L, Second Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILL: Petition of 26 citizens of Hamilton, Ohio, for the improvement of the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of National Convention of Insurance Commissioners, relating to the need of legislation to deny the use of United States mails to unworthy and unauthorized insurance companies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, favoring the Foraker safety appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACK (by request): Petition of W. F. Pauley and 4 other druggists of Apollo, Pa., urging the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Glen Campbell, Pa., for the passage of a bill to forbid the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Apollo, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution defining legal marriage to be monogamic, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the United Presbyterian Congregation of Freeport, Pa., in support of the McCumber bill and in relation to the sale of liquor in immigrant stations, Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Petition of citizens of the Second Congressional district of Minnesota and letter of C. E. Hamilton, of Bellingham, Minn., urging the passage of House bill 178, for the reduction of the tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of E. J. Phelps, of Minneapolis, Minn., in favor of the good-roads bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRELL: Resolutions of the legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Pennsylvania, in favor of House bill 15990, known as the employers' liability bill; also favoring the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the same, favoring the Grosvenor anti-injunction bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Petitions of Connell Brothers, R. L. Phelps, and other citizens of Daws County, Nebr., protesting against leasing of public lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Frank Iams and other citizens of Howard County, Nebr., urging the passage of House bill 16656—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REEDER: Petition of Methodist Episcopal Church conference of Beloit circuit, Kansas, to prohibit liquor selling in

Government buildings, etc.—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Plymouth, Mich., in favor of Senate bill 909, providing for the extension of the free mail delivery service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of Joseph R. Smith Post, No. 76, Grand Army of the Republic, Monroe, Mich., favoring the passage of House bill 10784, for a monument to the soldiers who fell in the battle of River Raisin in the war of 1812 and 1813—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STARK: Resolutions of the Blue Valley Division, No. 343, Order of Railway Conductors, Fairbury, Nebr., in favor of the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Angelica, N. Y., against repeal of the anti-liquor law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Paper to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Mrs. Eleanor B. Cayton—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG: Resolution of legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen of Pennsylvania, favoring Senate bill 3560, known as the Foraker safety-appliance bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring a survey for a 30-foot channel improvement for the Delaware River at Philadelphia—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 13, 1903.

General WILLIAM BOOTH, of the Salvation Army, offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, maker, sustainer, and governor of all things, we, Thy servants, the work of Thy hands, come into Thy presence this morning to supplicate Thy blessing upon ourselves, upon those dependent upon us, and the world round about us.

We acknowledge before Thee our obligations for all the good things that we enjoy. Thy goodness and Thy mercy have followed each one of us all the days of our lives, and are flowing around us at the present moment. Thou hast not only made us, but fed us and clothed us and housed us and befriended us and provided ways and means by which, though we may have fallen from Thy sight and given ourselves up to the doing of things that have brought down upon ourselves the exposure to Thy just displeasure, yet Thou hast made a wonderful way and a wonderful contrivance by which we can be regulated, can be saved, and can be rescued from the circumstances in which we find ourselves. Thou hast made salvation and happiness, goodness and truth and love possible to us here and possible to us in the world to come.

We thank Thee, we adore Thee, we worship Thee. We not only acknowledge our obligation, but we desire to make some suitable response to it. In what we feel in our innermost hearts, in what we think about these matters, no response can be accepted by Thee but what is to be satisfactory to our own conscience and our own judgment here and hereafter by the rendering of ourselves up as willing sacrifices and the carrying out of Thy wishes and the doing of Thy blessed will.

We thank Thee that Thou hast made it possible for each one of us, when we pray as individuals, to feel the light and truth and power of Thy holy Spirit, and that through the sacrifices of our Lord we may not only see what we ought to do, but be directed through it not only to begin but to finish, that we may have satisfaction in the last moments of earth and not be discouraged.

And now, Lord, we pray for this great nation, for this great heart of hearts of this mighty country—the very center of its activities; the place where it exercises its power and its strength. We pray for Thy blessings on this great nation. We thank Thee for all Thy goodness to it, and we pray that Thy blessing may be continued to it, and that through Thy loving-kindness it may be not only great and capable of promoting the highest possible degree of happiness and well-being of its own people, but that it may by Thy great grace be made a great power in the world, and make a glorious stand for righteousness and truth and peace and happiness among the nations.

To this end we pray for Thy servant who at the present time is placed at its head; for him and for his family and for all associated with him; that he may have wisdom and benevolence and courage to enable him to discharge the great and solemn duties that have devolved upon him.

We pray Thy blessing for the men who sit in this and the adja-

cent Chamber, that the men here will reason, that the men here will think, that the men here will plan, that the men here will seek only compliance in those measures and opinions which are wisest and best. Oh, may they seek Thy wisdom, and may they rely on Thy great arm, and may the results of their deliberations end in the direction of Thy glory and the good of mankind. Remember the peoples that are more or less influenced by them, and while they are considering matters that are for the welfare of this great people, may they not only consider those who are so circumstanced and environed as to be able to secure those conditions of life that are essential to health and morality and religion, but may they remember those who have perhaps, properly speaking, no representative to voice their sorrows and their toils and their cares. Remember, in Thy infinite mercy, these poor and lost members of the community, and may Thy blessing be upon us all.

May we do our work, may we do it well, may we do it with satisfaction to our own consciences and satisfaction to our laws, so that when we meet again we shall meet in the center of the government of the universe before the great throne, and we may have the satisfaction of hearing Thee say to us individually and to those we love, our families, wives, and children, "Well done, good and faithful servants, enter thou into the joy of Thy Lord." For Jesus Christ's sake, our Saviour, who saves us now and all the time, and evermore. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, if there be no objection. It is approved.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I ask that the prayer which was delivered in this Chamber this morning may be included in the RECORD of to-day's proceedings.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be done.

WASHINGTON, ALEXANDRIA AND MOUNT VERNON RAILWAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Railway Company for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1902; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 6961) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between the city of Chamberlain, in Brule County, and Lyman County, in the State of South Dakota.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13307) for the relief of Valdemar Poulsen.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate to correct an error in the enrollment of the bill (S. 569) to establish the department of commerce and labor.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 5678) providing for the record of deeds and other conveyances and instruments of writing in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 7159) authorizing the Memphis, Helena and Louisiana Railway Company to construct and maintain a bridge across St. Francis River, in the State of Arkansas;

A bill (S. 7185) to authorize the board of commissioners for the Connecticut bridge and highway district to construct a bridge across the Connecticut River at Hartford, in the State of Connecticut;

A bill (S. 7226) to authorize the Pittsburg, Carnegie and Western Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River;

A bill (H. R. 3504) granting an increase of pension to Grace A. Negley;

A bill (H. R. 5101) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Contal;

A bill (H. R. 6332) granting a pension to Michael Conlon;

A bill (H. R. 7110) granting an increase of pension to Aurelia M. Powers;

A bill (H. R. 7642) providing for the holding of terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States at Kansas City, Kans., and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8663) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles F. Woodford and grant him an honorable discharge;

A bill (H. R. 9107) granting a pension to Austin A. Vore;